

THE CATHOLIC MIND

OL. XLV

MAY, 1947

NO. 1013

The Heart of Our Mother

*Reprinted from The TRIBUNE**

MARY, the Mother of our Saviour, is justly hailed as "Co-Redemp-trix" and "Mediatrice of Graces" by Catholics—though thereby they imply no slightest derogation from the honor due to her Son, as the sole source of life and salvation to mankind. He is her Saviour and God as well as ours; in him she "lives and moves and has her being"—and she has nothing that she has not received. Nevertheless, it was the Divine Will that she should be chosen, out of all our race, as the Vessel of Honor from which the stream of Redemption was poured out upon the world; it was her acceptance of that Will—"Ecce Ancilla Domini"—which reversed the effect of Eve's fall and began the work of our redemption. Those who are incorporated in Christ's Mystical Body, therefore, must be incorporated with her, also, as His Mother, and therefore our own.

It is to be remembered, too, that, from the time when the Heart of the Divine Child beat beneath her's, Mary was close beside Him throughout His life, caring for His infancy and childhood, watching the flowering of His Manhood in her home at Nazareth; and finally following Him through the days of His public life, to the end of that hard road, at the foot of the Cross. All through those years there grew in her heart, amid the joy of His companionship, the increasing bitterness of the pain which she had embraced at the Annunciation—the Sword of prophecy which was to pierce her soul. Her sorrow reflected

* 312 Lonsdale St., Melbourne, C. 1, Australia, May 11, 1944

that of the Beloved—she shared with Him, so far as mere humanity could, in the fearful Agony of Gethsemane and the Passion, and the utter darkness of His dereliction on Calvary; and her sorrow, like His, was the fruit of man's sin—willingly endured for our salvation.

"My true love hath my heart, and I have his," sings the poet; and when has such a union of hearts existed as between these two lovers, the Mother and her Son? It is very natural, then, that the growth of devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus in the Church should be accompanied by the development of piety towards that other pure heart which alone can be said to "beat as one" with that of Our Lord. Actually, the two cults were initiated at the same period—the greater owing its origin to the revelation of Christ to St. Margaret Mary, the lesser to the zeal of St. John Eudes, founder of the Congregation of Jesus and Mary. The devotion to the Immaculate Heart of Mary spread widely in France in the eighteenth century, but almost disappeared with the Revolution, until its modern revival began with the revelation of the Miraculous Medal to St. Catherine Laboure in 1830. By the time of the last war, the association founded in honor of the Heart of Mary numbered forty million adherents . . . but the end was not yet.

OUR LADY OF FATIMA

The emergence of the devotion of the Immaculate Heart to the movement of world importance which it has now become dates from the six Apparitions of Our Lady to three peasant children at Fatima, in Portugal. The message received by these children from the Mother of God was a threefold one. They were informed of the Divine desire that this devotion should be established; that reparation should be done for sins against God and against the pure heart of Mary, by sacrifice and prayer, especially the Rosary; and, lastly, that the whole world should be consecrated to the Immaculate Heart. Many wonders accompanied the Visitation, and at the shrine since set up in Fatima, miracles and conversions have been wrought in abundance. The evidences concerning these events having been fully examined, the devotions centering upon this holy place have been approved by the supreme Church authority, and Pius XII, in December, 1942, solemnly carried out the world-consecration requested by Our Lady. At the same time, he directed that this consecration should be repeated by the chief pastors of the Church for their own flocks.

While Our Lady made three requests at Fatima, she also uttered promises and made a warning prophecy to the world, whose fulfilment is now before us. To those who performed certain acts of reparation she pledged her aid at the hour of death; and she added:

"If my requests are heard, Russia will be converted and there will be peace. Otherwise, great errors will be spread through the world, giving rise to wars and persecutions of the Church; the good will suffer martyrdom, and the Holy Father will have to suffer much; different nations will be destroyed. But, in the end, my Immaculate Heart will triumph, and an era of peace will be granted to mankind."

How punctually the first part of the prophecy of Fatima has been performed is now visible to all. The Armistice of 1918 was followed by the Versailles Treaty—a settlement of power governed by secularist principles, followed by the setting up of a peace organization based on the same principles without regard to Christian influences. The Holy Father was excluded from the counsels of the nations and his advice disregarded. The penalties forecast have not been long in falling upon the apostate peoples: we have lived to see a return of chaos and barbarism which seemed incredible in 1919, and an explosion of anti-Christian fury unparalleled in modern times for its extent and ferocity.

Out of the darkness in which we lie, we turn our eyes to the Star of the Sea, the Mother of God, and we lift up our hands to plead that she may hasten the time of fulfilment of the second part of her promise—her own victory of love, and a period of peace for the bleeding world. At the moment, nothing—humanly speaking—might seem less probable than such a consummation. There is no visible sign that the carnival of horror and death through which we are living has broken the pride of self-worshipping man. The indications point to a new order based on triumphant force, possibly even more cynical and materialistic than that which has collapsed into ruins, and to a "social reconstruction" governed by the thought of men whose paganism is tinged with a growing hostility towards the Faith.

But we have only to look at our own Christian past to know how deceptive such apparent trends can be, and how suddenly the hidden forces of new life can emerge from the midst of death and decay. It is only a step from Diocletian's reign of fear and death to the triumph of Constantine; and that step may be taken again, if we follow the road which the Queen of Heaven has pointed out to us. May?—nay, it *will* be taken, whether sooner or later; for her pledges are not made void,

and her intercession is all-powerful with her Divine Son. Let us join, then, joyfully and fervently, in an act of consecration to the heart of Mary our Mother, that through her love and patronage we may be delivered from death, and the nations, restored to peace, may rise up and call her Blessed.

Cooperation with Non-Catholics

We welcome every sincere effort that has for its objective the elimination of hatred and conflict between classes, colors, nationalities, races and individuals. We wish to co-operate with our fellow-citizens in all efforts of public, social and civic welfare and particularly in the elimination of moral and physical evils. On the other hand, however, we cannot be a party to programs which seek to achieve this brotherhood by ignoring and endeavoring to eliminate religious differences, or which would ask us to permit our people to participate in forms of common religious worship. Much as we must love those who are separated from us by religious differences, never for a moment can we admit that they are objectively right in their religious views. It cannot be expected that, under the pretext of eliminating differences between our people, we should ally ourselves with those who on other occasions calumniate us and misrepresent the Church's teachings and the attitude of the Holy Father, bishops and priests in matters affecting the sphere of religion where the attitude of the Church cannot be reconciled with secularistic ideals of harmony, falsely paraded as democracy or the American way of life. Accordingly, we recommend that our people who are thoroughly familiar with their religion, its background and directives, with the consent of the Church's divinely constituted authorities, who alone are competent in matters of doctrine and morality, express a willingness to co-operate in measures and organizations which do not sponsor activities forbidden by religion and the natural law. —*From the 1947 Lenten Pastoral of Bishop Thomas H. McLaughlin.*

The Kremlin and the Vatican

N. S. TIMASHEFF

*Reprinted from The MARIANIST**

ONE of the most important, but still highly problematical, issues of our day is the establishment of some form of relationship between the Vatican and Moscow. The issue is important because of the great number of Catholics who, as a result of the war, are now within the Russian orbit; and problematical because of the open hostility which Kremlin leaders continue to show toward Catholicism in general and the Vatican in particular.

The official anti-religious attitude in Russia was considerably modified during the war, in deference to the patriotism shown by Orthodox leaders and faithful in the hour of national crisis. By 1944, the Russian Orthodox Church had been officially recognized, and anti-religious propaganda curbed to a great degree. In the following year, when the Church was permitted to hold its first general council since the Revolution, Acting Patriarch Alexei was formally elected supreme head of the Church, and enthroned with elaborate ceremonial in the presence of state representatives and leading Orthodox prelates from Russia and other countries.

With certain important limitations,

one of which concerns religious propaganda, the Orthodox Church is making headway, but it is still a question for the future whether the Kremlin will eventually extend a similar degree of tolerance toward the Roman Catholic Church both within the borders of Russia proper and the areas where large Catholic populations are now under Russian domination.

Speculation over a possible Russian-Vatican agreement that would preserve the religious rights of these groups was heightened in the spring of 1944 when the world's attention was focussed on the visit to Moscow of the Polish-American priest, Father Orlemanski. According to press reports, Father Orlemanski held conferences with Marshal Stalin and Commissar of Foreign Affairs Molotov and pleaded for religious tolerance in Poland, the Ukraine and White Russia, where populations are largely Catholic. Stalin was quoted as having promised cooperation with the Catholic Church in these territories and as having affirmed his desire for universal religious freedom. However, no official document was ever published to substantiate these reported pledges.

* 108 Franklin St., Dayton 2, Ohio, March, 1947

Subsequently certain other developments tended to nurture hopes of an eventual understanding between the Soviet government and the Holy See. One of these occurred in 1945 when the Russian-dominated Polish provisional government, inaugurating a sweeping agrarian reform program to bring about redistribution of land among small farmers, exempted land belonging to the Church—this, in Poland, meaning the Catholic Church.

Another development took place last March when, to the amazement of the world, Soviet delegates to the General Assembly of the United Nations attended a Pontifical Mass at St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York. Representatives of the Soviet government have already been seen on solemn occasions in Russian Orthodox churches, but the presence of Soviet delegates in a Catholic Cathedral was interpreted as a significant indication of Russia's desire to come to terms with the Vatican.

ANTI-CATHOLIC ATTACKS

Hopes of agreement still persist, but there is a dark side to the picture which cannot be overlooked. Whatever may be going on behind the scenes at the Kremlin, it is all too apparent that a systematic anti-Vatican campaign has been sponsored by Soviet newspapers since 1944, obviously with official approval, because nothing appears in the Russian press

which is not agreeable to the Communist rulers of the Soviet Union. Here are the highlights of these anti-Catholic attacks.

On February 1, 1944, *Izvestia*, organ of the Soviet government, published an article asserting that the foreign policy of the Vatican is pro-Fascist. A week later, *Red Star*, official Soviet Army paper, printed an extract from a pamphlet denouncing "the Vatican's intrigues in the international arena."

When the names of the thirty-two new cardinals were announced by the Holy See, *Izvestia* (January 27, 1946) interpreted this as another attempt of the Vatican "to spread reactionary policies throughout the world." The paper was especially alarmed by the fact that most of the thirty-two new Cardinals were non-Italians.

One month later, *Pravda* cited a French book accusing the Vatican of having had a political agreement with Hitler and of having used this agreement forcibly to convert to Catholicism Russians in areas occupied by the German armies. In April and May, 1946, the Moscow radio frequently criticized the Vatican, accusing it of unlawful interference in political campaigns in some of the European countries, especially in Italy, in order to influence "unenlightened voters" against the parties of the Left.

In addition to its own press, the Soviet government has many times

used the Russian Orthodox Church as an instrument of its anti-Vatican policy. In April, 1944, Patriarch Sergius, just one month before his death, published in the *Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate* an article opposing the Pope's claim to be the Vicar of Christ. When the new Patriarch was elected, the national council of the Orthodox Church addressed a message to the Christians of the world denouncing the "pro-fascist attitude of the Vatican" allegedly manifested in the Pope's plea for clemency toward the German people.

Deeds have accompanied words. Both in Russia and in the zone of Soviet dominance, acts of direct or indirect persecution of the Catholics have been numerous. This is especially true of Yugoslavia where a deliberate attempt is being made to uproot the Church.

One noteworthy fact that emerges against this somber background is that the Vatican, despite its unqualified condemnation of Communism and every act of Soviet persecution, has not missed an opportunity to praise such acts of the Soviet government as have conformed to Christian ethics.

The Holy See did not, for example, conceal its pleasure over recent changes in Soviet divorce law and over the high moral tone of recent Soviet films exalting marital fidelity. Furthermore, when Marshal Stalin, in March, 1946, declared that, in his opinion, no real danger of war was

present, his statement was warmly commended by *Osservatore Romano*, semi-official Vatican newspaper, as truly Christian.

The conflict between the Kremlin and the Vatican remains, and, in a strict sense, despite frequent rumors of negotiations, nothing has really happened to solve it. However, just as in the case of Mussolini's Italy and Hitler's Germany, the Catholic Church can wait, if necessary, until Russia is liberated from the totalitarian yoke.

Relations between Soviet Russia and the Vatican have never been good, but hopes that some satisfactory *modus vivendi* may be reached in the future are encouraged by the precedent set in 1847—one hundred years ago—when a concordat was signed between Rome and the Russian Empire. This was after the capital of Russia was moved to St. Petersburg and the Orthodox Church had ceased to emphasize claims designating Moscow as the "Third Rome," in other words, the center of Christianity. It is to be noted, incidentally, that this claim has recently been reiterated by leaders of Russia's re-established state Church.

The concordat of 1847 remained in effect until 1863, when the Poles rose in arms against the Russian Emperor, and Russia severed all diplomatic relations with the Vatican. Historical factors were involved in this break, since the Poles were tra-

ditionally associated with Roman Catholicism, while the terms Russian and Orthodox were likewise held to be synonymous. Not until 1894, when the Imperial government considered the Polish question no longer existed, were diplomatic relations resumed.

During that time adequate provisions existed to care for the religious needs of the Catholic population in the empire, numbering about twelve million, mainly Poles and Lithuanians. There were twelve Catholic dioceses, headed by the Archbishop of Mohilev, eight seminaries, and a theological academy at Moscow. Salaries of the Catholic clergy, then totaling around 4,500, were paid by the Imperial government, and in addition, financial grants were provided for the religious education of Catholic children.

RUSSIAN-VATICAN RELATIONS

All possible bases of Russian relations with the Vatican were demolished by the Communist Revolution of 1917, when Moscow, no longer making any pretense of being the Third Rome, became the avowed center instead of an international anti-Church movement seeking to conquer the world for atheism and materialism.

The subsequent policies of the Communist leaders were such as could well be expected. Catholic bishops and priests, along with Russian Orthodox prelates and clergymen, were tried and sentenced to death or to

long terms in prison camps. The Godless Union, sponsored by the Soviet government, harshly assailed the Pope in its publications and "demonstrations," identifying him with the leaders of world capitalism, whose aim, they said, was the destruction of the Red Paradise that was to be built in Russia.

Up until 1939, the conflict was acute but there was no arena in which the forces of religion and atheism could really fight. Within the boundaries of the Soviet Union as they were traced in 1919-21, only small, ineffective groups of Catholics lived. Meanwhile outside of these boundaries, the Communist leaders themselves were almost powerless, having at their disposal only the Communist parties of the various countries, these in turn being weak and often without legal recognition.

The drastic change which served to revive the basis for diplomatic relations between Moscow and the Vatican came in 1939-40 when territorial annexations, reasserted in 1944-46, were made. East of the new boundary there are today many millions of Catholics—at least eight, perhaps ten. To the West is the zone of Soviet dominance, comprising such countries as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Horvatia-Slovenia (part of Yugoslavia), inhabited by tens of millions of Catholics. In this zone, Communist parties are now strong and often take part in the

national governments presiding over countries with predominantly Catholic populations. This makes the question of a Vatican-Soviet agreement not only important, but one of the most pressing in Europe today.

Observers of Soviet foreign policy are often puzzled by its duality, or fluctuations between a relatively friendly trend, and another characterized by utmost unfriendliness. The same can be observed in the present-day attitude of the Communist leaders toward the Vatican.

The attitude of the Vatican toward the Russian state has meanwhile been one of consistent condemnation of the materialistic and atheistic nature of its government and of deep and lively concern for the Russian people. This distinction was made clear in Pope Pius XI's encyclical on *Atheistic Communism*, which declares:

It is no part of our intention to condemn in mass the people of the Soviet Union. For them we cherish the warmest

paternal affection. We are well aware that not a few among them groan beneath the yoke imposed on them by men who in very large part are strangers to the real interests of the country. We recognize that many others were deceived by fallacious hopes. We blame only the system, with its authors and abettors, who considered Russia the best prepared field for experimentation with a plan elaborated decades ago.

Offering daily prayers at her altars for the conversion of Russia and the welfare of her people, the Vatican strikingly gave concrete proof of its paternal interest in the Russian people when, in 1930, it sent a relief mission into the Soviet Union to succor great numbers dying from hunger. Its hope for the future is that, when full religious liberty is restored in Russia, it may find a way to exercise its influence also on behalf of the spiritual welfare of Catholic remnants in Russia proper and of millions of other Catholics who now live under the political shadow of the Kremlin.

Don't Blame Me

No one—person, party, or corporate body—assumes responsibility for what is wrong with the world. Indeed, some of us believe that the only thing right in the world is our persistent power to see what is wrong with it. We beat our breasts at the misfortune, but assure the world it was "through his fault, through her fault, through their most grievous faults—don't blame me." And we wash our hands.—*Don Capellano* in *THE LABOR LEADER*, New York, N. Y., Feb. 28, 1947.

Education and the Crisis of Christian Culture

CHRISTOPHER DAWSON

*Reprinted from LUMEN VITAE**

THE PRESENT CRISIS OF OUR CIVILIZATION. ITS PROFOUND CAUSE: THE DECAY OF EDUCATION

I DO not think there is any need for me to insist on the fundamental thesis that the present crisis of Western civilization is due to the separation of our culture from its religious basis. This is widely recognized today, even by thinkers who are very far removed from the traditional Christian position. But I think people are still not sufficiently aware of how great the responsibility of education has been in this disastrous process nor have the educationalists themselves really faced the disconcerting fact that the more education has advanced, at least quantitatively, the more our civilization has become secularized, so that the separation of our culture from its religious basis seems to be directly related to the spread of universal education.

Nor was this due to people being unaware of the danger. It was recognized from the beginning not merely by exceptionally religious people but by politicians and men of affairs. The Duke of Wellington

with his usual horse-sense put the whole thing in a nutshell when he said: "Take care what we are about, for unless you base all this on religion you are only making so many clever devils."

But the Duke of Wellington was not an educationalist and his opinions were dismissed by the representatives of progressive ideas as the views of a reactionary, which indeed they were. Nevertheless he was justified and we see today what a mess these clever devils have made of our world. No doubt the real source of the evil is to be found not in the universalization of education, but in the destruction of the old hierarchy of divinity, humanity and natural science that was the tradition of European higher education. The real evil of popular education was not so much its secularism but its utilitarian character which led to the progressive discarding of all non-secular elements and motives. It is true that in this country and in America we had a sort of alliance between dogmatic religion and secular utilitarianism which was characteristic of the Victorian and

* 27, rue de Spa, Brussels, Belgium, April-June, 1946

nineteenth-century compromise. But it was an unnatural alliance which was incapable of withstanding the growing pressure of secularist culture. At the same time that this bleak utilitarianism was being replaced by a more humanist ideal of popular education, humanism itself was losing its prestige and its influence on higher education. As the idea of culture becomes divorced alike from religion and life, its social significance rapidly disappeared, until today we are witnessing a regular war against culture and the apotheosis of the common man and the little man and the tough guy—a regular pantheon of strange gods who are emerging from some underworld of culture in the half light between the old European day and the dark night of total barbarism.

NEGLECT OF SPIRITUAL FORCES

I do not think our civilization will be saved from this fate by the quantitative progress of education on the existing lines: that is to say, by more education given to more people for longer and longer periods. Indeed the extension of public education—that is to say, the attempt of a single uniform educational system to mould the whole mind of the whole community by a single all embracing educational system—only increases the mass-mindedness of modern society without raising its cultural standards or deepening its spiritual life.

It is possible that after the war we shall see a great intensification of educational effort especially in the East and in the non-European world. But behind this there will be a strong competitive socio-political motive similar to that which inspired the educational efforts of the Soviets during the past twenty years. At its best this means the raising of the standards of life for all the backward and exploited peoples and classes, at its worst it may mean no more than the mass conditioning of populations for purposes of power politics. But in either case there is the same danger of an over-emphasis on the utilitarian motive and a neglect of the deeper spiritual forces which have been the creative element in all the great cultures of the past, whether Christian or non-Christian.

In the West, however, we have already passed through this phase. The Economic Man had become a commonplace to our great grandfathers, and the Utilitarians are more remote than the pre-Raphaelites. The time has come for us to retrace our steps, to see what we have lost in two centuries of economic progress and world conquest and to consider how we can recover contact with the essential realities on which the existence of our civilization depends. If we admit, (as I think we all do in principle), that Western Culture was a Christian creation—that Europe is the daughter of Christendom

—we ought to pay much more attention to this truth in our educational theory and practice than we have done during the past. I don't think we can say that the average young man or woman leave their school or university with any clear conception of this fact.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION IN DAYS GONE-BY.
RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF TODAY

Taken in its widest sense education is simply the process by which the new members of a community are initiated into its ways of life and thought from the simplest elements of behavior or manners up to the highest tradition of spiritual wisdom. Christian education is, therefore, an initiation into the Christian way of life and thought, and for one thousand two hundred years, more or less, the peoples of Europe have been submitted to this influence. The process has been intensive at some points, superficial at others, but taking it as a whole it may be said that nowhere else in the history of mankind can we see such a mighty stream of intellectual and moral effort directed through so many channels to a single end. However incomplete its success may have been, there is no doubt that it has changed the world and people have no right to talk of the history of Western civilization unless they have done their best to understand its aims and its methods.

But on the whole they have not

done so. It has been neglected both by the historians and by the educationalists who have tended to approach their subjects from a different point of view. It is true that a treatment of history which is openly hostile or contemptuous of Christian Culture, like that of Gibbon, is usually regarded as biased, but it is quite possible to write of European culture as of national history leaving the Christian tradition entirely out of the picture without the average reader realizing that anything is missing. Nevertheless, it was that tradition that conditioned the whole development of culture from the fifth to the nineteenth century and which created the standards of value and the vision of reality which inspired its most characteristic achievements. Today religious education is apt to be considered a kind of extra, insecurely tacked on to the general educational structure not unlike a Gothic church in a modern housing estate. But in the past it was the foundation on which the whole edifice of culture was based and which was deeply embedded below the surface of social consciousness.

For from the beginning Christian education was conceived not so much as learning a lesson but as introduction into a new life, or still more as an initiation into a mystery. The early manuals of Christian education, like the Catechetical Discourses of St. Cyril or the *De Catechizandis Rudi-*

bus of St. Augustine, all stress the esoteric character of the teaching. For example, at the beginning of St. Cyril of Jerusalem's Discourses we read the following notice: "These Catechetical Lectures thou mayest put into the hands of candidates for Baptism and of baptized believers, but by no means of Catechumens nor of any others who are not Christians as thou shalt answer to the Lord. And if thou takest a copy of them write this in the beginning, as in the sight of the Lord." Christian education was something that could not be conveyed by words alone, but which involved a discipline of the whole man; a process of catharsis and illumination which centered in the sacred mysteries, and which was embodied in a cycle of symbolism and liturgical action.

Thus Christian education was not only an initiation into the Christian community, it was also an initiation into *another world*: the unveiling of spiritual realities of which the natural man was unaware and which changed the meaning of existence. And I think it is here that our modern education—including our religious education—has proved defective. There is in it no sense of *revelation*. It is accepted as instruction, sometimes as useful knowledge, often as tiresome task work in preparation for some examination, but nowhere do we find that joyful sense of the discovery of a new and won-

derful reality which inspired true Christian culture. All true religious education leads up to the contemplation of divine mysteries, and where this is lacking, the whole culture becomes weakened and divided.

It may be objected that this is the sphere of worship and not of education; but it is impossible to separate the two, since it was largely in the sphere of worship that the Christian tradition of education and culture arose and developed. The first Christian education was the initiation into the divine mysteries in the liturgical sense, and it brought with it a development of religious poetry and music and art which was the first-fruits of Christian culture.

It is perhaps difficult for us to appreciate the educational significance of this, because the Christian liturgy and its associated literature and art are still accepted as a living element in our contemporary religious life so that we do not at once realize how different is the position it holds in our culture from that which it held in the past.

At the present day, the Church is but one institution amongst a whole series of cultural organs which compete with one another to form public opinion—the cinema and the wireless, drama and fiction, the press and the advertisement industry, not to mention the youth movements and the political parties. But in the past, for whole centuries and especially for the

common people, the Church covered the whole orbit of culture and it was only in the Church that the ordinary man found instruction, inspiration and spiritual sustenance. The Churches still stand as the most striking objects in the European landscape, whether they dominate the cities like Chartres and Lincoln or whether they are lost in the countryside like the village churches of England. But in either case, they are monuments of a vanished age and culture, and they are no longer the vital centers of the community to which they belong. We must see them as they were in the days of their glory—glowing with color, rich with sculpture, and filled with the music and dramatic action of the liturgy—power-houses of the spirit—to realize the place they once held in the life of a people, which was in other respects far poorer than it is today.

Yet even today the Churches in their comparatively derelict condition are by no means negligible in their influence on culture. To quote my own experience, I should say that I learnt more—much more—during my own school days from my visits to the Cathedral at Winchester than I did from the hours of religious instruction in school. That great Church with its tombs of the Saxon kings and the medieval statesmen Bishops gave one a much greater sense of the magnitude of the religious element in our culture and the

depths of its roots in our national life than anything one could learn from books. Nor was it merely a question of widening one's historical sense, it also deepened one's spiritual sense of religion as an objective reality far transcending one's private experience. And if this can be so even today, how much more in the past when the cult of the saints and the holy places consecrated the whole historical and geographical context of culture and gave every social relation and activity its appropriate religious symbolism.

CATHOLIC CONCEPTION AND PROTESTANT CONCEPTION OF EDUCATION

In Northern Europe this accumulated treasure of religious symbolism was dispersed by the Reformation which destroyed the liturgical character of popular culture and at the same time caused a great breach in the historical continuity of Christian tradition. Nevertheless, it did not by any means undervalue the importance of religious education. On the contrary, the reformers regarded their work largely as a reform or restoration of Christian education, which corresponded on the religious side to the renaissance of classical learning on the part of the humanists. Back to the Bible, the Bible only and the Bible for all; these were the slogans of the new religious education which so profoundly transformed our culture in the sixteenth and seventeenth

centuries. And this involved important changes of psychological approach. It emphasized the literary element in education at the expense of the aesthetic, and it increased the importance of the individual as against the community. Wherever the Protestant tradition of education had free play—in Scotland, Puritan England, Geneva and New England for example—it had a marked effect in increasing the literacy of the common people and in developing individualism, moral activism and independence of judgment, though this was paid for by losses in other directions which showed themselves in the growing impoverishment of the communal life of society.

Volumes may be written on the social consequences of this divergence between the two traditions of Christian education—the liturgical Catholic and the Biblical Protestant. But they have not been written, so far as I am aware, and even in the discussions that have arisen on the possibility of an agreed syllabus of religious education, this aspect of the question has been little regarded. The divergence was no doubt to some extent reduced by the strong influence of humanist education on Catholic and Protestant alike. Moreover, the two traditions influenced one another even at the period when religious disagreement was sharpest. Thus the Catechism, which from the sixteenth century almost to the present

day has been the regular method of religious instruction, was of Protestant origin, but has become no less characteristic of modern Catholic religious education, while from the other side the Jesuit system of education exercised a considerable influence on Protestant grammar schools and academies.

SECULAR UTILITARIANISM

But if the combined influence of Renaissance and Reformation made for the wider diffusion of literary culture and the intellectualizing of religious education, it also tended to increase the practical and utilitarian elements of culture. Both the Byzantine East and the mediæval West had shared the same ideal of contemplation and spiritual vision as the supreme end and justification of all human culture: an ideal which finds classical expression in St. Thomas and Dante. But from the fifteenth century onwards culture and education became increasingly concerned with the claims of active life. The humanist ideal of an all-round cultivation of man's physical and intellectual abilities was brought into relation with the Protestant ideal of what Troeltsch has called secular or *innerweltlicher* ascetism—of sanctification by the diligent exercise of man's "calling"—of doing his duty in the state of life in which it has pleased God to call him. And this in turn led to the cultivation of the economic virtues of

thrift and industry and to the acquisition of "useful knowledge" as the main end of education.

There can be no doubt that secular utilitarianism was the direct product and heir of the religious utilitarianism that developed on the soil of Protestant and specifically of Puritan culture: for though Bentham himself was a disciple of the French Enlightenment, he was but the rationalizer of the movement, and its most characteristic types are a real native product of Protestant culture. Now while this tradition, which we may call the tradition of Samuel Smiles, generated a great force of moral and practical energy, it was also responsible for the harsh and unattractive character of modern culture. One of the greatest Victorian educationalists—Matthew Arnold—was never tired of insisting on this, and unlike most of his modern successors, he was not afraid to trace it back to its theological roots.

The period which is now ending for England, [he wrote] is that which began when, after the sensuous tumult of the Renaissance, Catholicism being discredited and gone, our serious nature desired, as had been foretold, to see one of the days of the Son of Man and did not see it, but men said to them: see here and see there, and they went after the blind guides and followed the false direction, and the actual civilization of England and America is the result. A civilization with many virtues, but without lucidity of mind and without largeness of temper. And now we English, at any rate, have to acquire them, and to learn

the necessity for us, "to live (as Emerson says) from a greater depth of being." The sages and the saints alike have always preached this necessity; the so called practical people and men of the world have always derided it. In the present collapse of this wisdom we ought to find it less hard to rate their stock ideas and stock phrases, their clap trap and their catchwords at their proper value, and to cast in our lot boldly with the sages and with the saints.¹

Arnold preached this doctrine indefatigably to Mid-Victorian England, and he was in an exceptionally favorable position to influence educational policy, since for thirty-five years he was an official of the Education Department and was appointed again and again as assistant commissioner to the royal commissions that were appointed to consider educational policy. Yet I do not think it can be said that his influence was great on the thing that mattered most, on which he was most right, namely, the spiritual foundation of culture. Not only so, but he was himself in part responsible for the general unpopularity and bad odor into which the idea of culture has fallen in this country. For Matthew Arnold was what is now known as a high-brow. He was indeed the original and archetypal high-brow, and the war he declared against the enemies of culture was ultimately followed by that reaction against culture and that Philistine reign of terror under which we live today.

¹ Preface to *Irish Essays*, 1882.

The fact is that culture by itself, even a humanist culture that is intellectually aware of the spiritual values of Christianity, does not possess the power of restoring or transforming the life of society. It provides standards of value, intellectual and æsthetic appreciation, the development of the power of criticism, width of knowledge and detachment from the prejudices and errors both of the multitude and of the ruling class. All this Arnold had—like his contemporaries Renan and Sainte-Beuve in France, or Emerson and Henry James and Henry Adams in America, all of them superior people who stood aside on their intellectual eminence and watched the stream of life go by. They none of them had the religious attitude to life, though they all realized how important it was to have it. They lacked faith and therefore they lacked charity and therefore they failed to gain men's sympathies and even aroused conscious or unconscious antagonism.

This is why the utilitarians, the apostles of useful knowledge and applied science, have been their superiors in the educational field, though their views were often so much more narrow and superficial. They had a simple naive faith in the value of concrete objective knowledge which they communicated to others. And this created a bond of sympathy between utilitarian high-brows like Bentham

and Mill and hard-headed practical men like Francis Place.

In the past, in a Christian society, the leaders of culture were just as critical of the views and behavior of common humanity as were the modern humanists. But even the most high-brow of Christian teachers such as Pascal and Newman stood on common ground with the common people before the supreme mystery of faith.

"God of Abraham, God of Isaac,
God of Jacob

(Not of the philosophers and men
of learning)

God of Jesus Christ

Deum meum et Deum vestrum."

The mystery of faith brings all men together at the heart of life, and it reduces the differences of culture, in the humanist sense of the word, to comparative insignificance.

FAITH IS BEGINNING AND END

Faith is therefore the beginning and end of Christian culture as it is the beginning and end of Christian morals. This is common to all forms of Christianity, Catholic, Orthodox and Protestant; only in so far as the conception of faith differs is there also a difference in the conception of culture. Indeed I do not think it is too far-fetched to suggest that the essential difference between the Catholic and Protestant conceptions of the relation of religion and culture is bound up with their respective conceptions of the relation of faith and

works, the famous controversy which above all others divided the Churches at the Reformation.

For just as the Catholics taught that there was a vital, organic, inseparable relation between faith and works, as against the Protestant view of justification by faith alone, so too in the Catholic view there is an organic relation between religion and culture, which the Protestant view does not as a rule recognize. And this I think is one of the main causes for that indifference of modern Protestantism to culture which was the burden of Matthew Arnold's controversial writings—the grimness and greyness of certain aspects of English and American life in the nineteenth century and the indifference of the most religious sections of English and American society to the cause of higher education.

Today this is a thing of the past. The harsh and ugly sub-culture of Victorian industrialism with its combination of unlimited acquisitiveness with narrow pietism has no defenders and the reaction against Puritanism has carried England and the United States to the opposite extreme of an extroverted hedonistic mass culture. But some things have been carried over from one extreme to the other without much change and the most important of these are the contempt for ideas, and the indifference to humane culture which are hardly less characteristic of the mass man

of today than of the individualistic Philistine of yesterday. The latter, even though they were themselves men of genuine religious faith and moral earnestness, were the destroyers of the Christian tradition of culture, and their successors have filled the void with a materialist pseudo-culture which is the real opium of the people, since it is at once a drug and an intoxicant and a poison.

For modern civilization today seems to be following the same road as the ancient world under the Roman Empire; on the one hand, a vast development of material resources and luxury—above all luxury for the masses—bread and games and baths and theatres; on the other, the vast development of power—the overwhelming pressure of unlimited power, concentrated in the hands of the masters of the world. But in our case the danger is greater, because our power and resources are incomparably greater and because the tradition we are losing is not that of the pagan city state, but that of Christendom. Nevertheless, this gloomy parallel is not altogether a hopeless one. For the decline of the classical culture and the growth of the massive power of the world state did not actually produce in the long run a materialist culture. It was followed by a sudden escape of humanity into a new spiritual dimension, the discovery of a new spiritual world and the acquisition of a new spiritual freedom. It

was the age of Tiberius and Nero that saw the coming of Christianity, and the breakdown of the giant fabric of the world state in the third century was followed by the rise of the new Christian culture.

**SALVATION FOR CONTEMPORARY HUMANITY:
THE RECOVERY OF A CHRISTIAN CULTURE**

The present crisis of our civilization can only be solved by a similar process of radical conversion and spiritual transformation. For hard as it may be to see the possibility of this, it is no less difficult to believe in the possibility of definite progress along the present line to some robot utopia. Indeed the catastrophies of the last thirty years are not only a sign of the bankruptcy of secular humanism, they only go to show that a completely secularized civilization is inhuman in the absolute sense—hostile to human life and irreconcilable with human nature itself. For as I have tried to explain in my recent books, especially *The Judgment of the Nations*, the forces of violence and aggressiveness that threaten to destroy our world are the direct result of the starvation and frustration of man's spiritual nature. For a time Western civilization managed to live on the normal tradition of the past, maintained by a kind of sublimated humanitarian idealism. But this was essentially a transitional phenomenon, and as humanism and humanitarianism fade away, we see societies more and more

animated by the blind will to power which drives them on to destroy one another and ultimately themselves. Civilization can only be creative and life-giving in the proportion that it is spiritualized. Otherwise the increase of power inevitably increases its power for evil—its destructiveness.

Therefore, it is only by the rediscovery of the spiritual world and the restoration of man's spiritual capacities that it is possible to save humanity from self-destruction. This is the immense task which Christian education has to undertake. It involves a great deal more than any Christian or any educationalist has yet realized. And this is inevitable because we are dealing with unknown factors which lie beyond our horizon of vision, below our level of consciousness and above the capacity of our reason: in other words, the problem concerns the future, the human soul and God: three things which we cannot understand. For this reason, modern man who has been accustomed to living in a world which is scientifically known and technologically controlled is in a worse position for dealing with the ultimate religious problems than his ancestors who were at every turn faced with mysterious forces over which they had no control and who consequently felt an obvious, immediate, practical sense of dependence on the power and assistance of God.

But this does not mean that we ought to acquiesce, as some modern

Christian thinkers are inclined to do, in the complete incomprehensibility and otherness of Faith—in a dualism of religion and culture which leaves no room for Christian education. The greater is our knowledge of nature and man and history, the greater is the obligation to use these increased resources for God, not merely in the way of moral action, but intellectually also, by the re-interpretation of the tradition of Christian culture in terms of the new knowledge, and by relating the instruments of culture to their true spiritual end.

At the present time there is a great danger that the part of culture should be undervalued and neglected both in the religious and the educational spheres. In the latter there is a tendency to sacrifice the humanities to science and technology; in the former there is the theological dualism to which I have just referred, which finds its most striking expression in the Barthian return to the theology of Luther and Calvin presented in a new dialectical form. Both these tendencies in their different ways are unfavorable to the traditional Christian culture and to the old discipline of studies which was conceived as an ascending scale of humanity, philosophy and divinity. The disintegration of higher education into a mass of divergent speculations co-ordinated only by motives of economic and political interest is fatal to any ideal of culture, and if, as is sometimes the

case, religious knowledge is treated as one of these independent specialisms, it is even more fatal to religion.

The recovery of a Christian culture is, therefore, the essential educational and religious task, and it is inseparable from the social ideal of Christendom—of the Christian people—*plebs Christiana*—*populus Dei*. This ideal, which has become so pale and remote to the individualism and secularism of the nineteenth century, and indeed of the whole modern world, lies at the very heart of Christianity. It was equally present in the Middle Ages when Christendom was a triumphant world culture and in the days when Christianity was a persecuted underground movement, but when, nevertheless, Christians were conscious of being a new people, "a third race" on whose heads the ends of the world were come.

If from the standpoint of the Roman man of the world these Christians were an uneducated lot of barbarians, we must remember that they were in reality just as much the heirs of a tradition of culture as the cultivated Hellenist and that they brought into the tired and sophisticated civilization of the Roman Empire the accumulated treasures of a profound spiritual experience which was on a different plane of reality from anything that Greece and Rome had known. And in the modern world there is a similar tradition of sacred culture which it has been the

mission of the Church to nourish and preserve. However secularized our modern civilization may become, this sacred tradition remains like a river in the desert, and a genuine religious education can still use it to irrigate the thirsty lands and to change the

face of the world with the promise of new life. The great obstacle is the failure of Christians themselves to understand the depth of that tradition and the inexhaustible possibilities of new and abundant life which it richly contains.



Red Cross Creed

I BELIEVE in the service of mercy. Wherever disaster calls, there I shall go to alleviate suffering and sorrow. I ask not who calls but where I am needed. I have no price for my service but accept gratitude that out of its largess I may expand my mission. I know no barriers of race, class, creed or country, no barriers of ideology, no obstacles of rivers, mountains, continents or seas.

Wherever human beings are in need, there I shall go to minister unto misery under my banner of merciful, fraternal love. An earthquake in Tokyo, a typhoon on the China coast, typhus in Asia, a landslide in Chile—all these call alike to my heart. An epidemic in Alaska, starvation in Greece, ravages of diseases, fires and floods in our own America—all these needs find me ready with my service.

I know no distinction between French and English, Russian and Greek, Italian and German, Czech and Pole—I serve all because I am of all, having been born of the finest instincts of mankind, faith in God and in His Son's redemptive mission, which my cross symbolizes, and merciful love for all, which my crimson color declares.

You who believe in me, you, so many of whom I have mothered in your sons and daughters, strengthen my hand and reanimate my courage, for I am the spirit of humanity marching beneath her cross.—
His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman.

World Role for U. S.

HANSON W. BALDWIN

*Reprinted from the New York Times**

HEAVERY are the responsibilities of power, and never heavier than in this age of dissolution and decay of old values and the emergence from the dust of dead empires of a new world order.

Today, the torrent of history is seeking a new channel. The forces of the surging waters are conflicting and convulsive, rolled and troubled; they tear at the dam of the past and undermine the ramparts of tradition.

They will not be stayed but they can be guided. The United States today lies squarely in the stream of history; it can guide that stream or be swept away by it. The new is inevitable; change is certain, but that change can be either malevolent or salutary. The United States, far more than any other single factor, is the key to the destiny of tomorrow; we alone may be able to avert the decline of Western civilization, and a reversion to nihilism and the Dark Ages.

Today's situation was neither unexpected nor unforetold. Plague and pestilence, suffering and disaster, famine and hardship and the complete economic and political dislocation of the world we had known was certain

to follow World War II. Titanic convulsions were the inevitable consequence of the titanic eruption of history's greatest war.

We are today in the midst of those convulsions. Germany is divided and broken, slowly starving, a cancerous growth in the heart of western Europe, a breeding place for the dark philosophy of Nietzsche. There festers in her ruins the poison of fascism, the virus of communism; either totalitarianism flourishes in decadence and destruction.

In the Netherlands, the wealth of the Indies no longer builds stately mansions; scores of thousands of Dutch want to emigrate from a broken Europe.

Belgium is scarred by old wounds and ancient animosities, and France—still politically bankrupt and ethically and intellectually confused—lies weak and torn and divided. Communism is strong in France, in the labor unions, in the Army, in the Air Force, in the government, in the underground; it could precipitate civil war at any time.

More than 20,000 irregulars, remnants of the Spanish republican forces, and French Communists form

* 229 W. 43rd St., New York, N. Y., March 2, 1947

a rag-tag, bob-tailed "army," owing no allegiance to France, which is scattered in southern France opposite the Spanish frontier, and is supplied intermittently with arms and equipment by Russia.

Communism is strong in Italy; the still secret peace treaty terms dealing with the disposition of ships of the Italian fleet may—when published—strengthen the left.

All Eastern Europe lies behind the iron curtain, and Greece, riven by strife, is the new frontier. The Palestine issue is still unsettled and in China the civil war is increasing in tempo.

EMPIRE IN LIQUIDATION

But most important to the course of history is the plight of Britain. Winston Churchill said he did not intend to preside at the liquidation of the British Empire but that is what is occurring today. The world's "Pax Britannica" was kept in decades past by the power of the British pound, and the power of the British fleet, supplemented by allies and a small but efficient regular army scattered over half the world.

Today, the power of the British pound has lost its magic and the British peoples, stripped of the wealth of empire and bowed under a crushing burden of taxation, are trying—in an economic sense—to pull themselves up by their boot-straps.

This means that the British pound

will no longer be available in Greece and in other areas of the earth to back up the forces of Western civilization; this means, inevitably in time, the reduction in size of the British Army, the British Navy, the British Air Force, with consequent creations, unless we fill them, of power vacuums in many unstable regions of the earth.

Nature and communism abhor vacuums. And there can now be no doubt; indeed, there has never been serious doubt, of the aggressive and expanding policy of the Soviet Government. Communism, as practiced in the world today, is a doctrine of fanatical virulence; its disciples justify and preach the pernicious philosophy that the ends justify any means. As long as such a Government holds power in Moscow there can be no real or lasting compromise with the values which Western civilization has held high for 2,000 years.

Yet Russia today is far weaker than the United States and may, indeed, long remain so, unless the heart and soul and spirit and will of the American people succumb to decay. The Russians do not yet have the atomic bomb, and many of their key industries—despite public assertions to the contrary—are considerably more concentrated and vulnerable than are ours.

The frantic Russian search for second-rate and third-rate atomic scientists and engineers in the countries bordering their frontiers indicates that

the Soviet is still some distance from achieving the atomic bomb, although one recent estimate—criticized by some as pessimistic—indicates that Russia may have the bomb and a fleet of perhaps 500 to 1,200 very long-range heavy bombers to carry it by 1950.

The Russians have virtually no Navy; their immediate attempt to compensate for our superiority at sea is confined largely to submarine development and construction, based on German designs.

But the United States has a clear and major lead in the air and, so far as can be learned, a smaller technological advantage in missiles and other new weapons, an advantage greatly aided by the superiority of our industry. But our land forces are weak, indeed, compared even with the demobilized Army of Russia.

RUSSIA AVERSE TO WAR

Russia is economically weak; she is experiencing severe shortages, particularly of food, and certainly wants no major war in the near future. But there is no doubt that her Government will take advantage of every weakness and will move into any power vacuum.

All this means that today the

United States and Russia are face to face in a struggle for the world, a conflict short of war, but a struggle, nevertheless, that will alter world history. The weakness of Britain and France, and the virtual dissolution of the rest of Western Europe means that the United States, and only the United States, is capable of sustaining Western civilization. Yet it is the inherent tragedy of our times that few of the American people seem to have a sense of historical responsibility, of their own personal responsibility for the future of history, of the national responsibility that inevitably goes with the power and the glory.

Today we have in real truth no finished, over-all military policy; our fighting forces are handicapped not only by demands for economy but by lack of legislation, and by piecemeal legislation. There is no rounded and complete policy to guide them in organization or development of our post-war forces.

The formulation of a sound and well-rounded military policy, which will provide effective support for our foreign policy, and promote efficiency and reasonable economy is probably the most important job of this session of Congress.

Recreation is inseparable from character formation and fashioning the Catholic character is too important to cultivate apart from Catholic principles.—*Gabriel A. Zema, S.J. in the ISO BULLETIN, April, 1947.*

Is the Closed Shop a Danger to Democratic Liberty?

*Reprinted from CIP**

THE closed shop is fast becoming the key issue in the dispute over labor-management relations in the United States. Four states have already passed laws banning the closed shop, two states have completed drafting bills for that purpose, and several others have scheduled such legislation for discussion.¹ Congress for some time has been considering taking action against the closed shop, and, according to newspaper reports, the leaders supporting some such measure now feel that they might be able to secure the approval of a majority. Labor leaders, on the other hand, oppose these moves as "punitive" and crippling.

No sound judgment on the issue is possible, however, unless we first know what the closed shop is and what it is trying to do. Unless we know this, we have no basis for judging whether the closed shop is bad in itself and merits legislative ban, whether it has given rise to abuses which call rather for regulation, or, finally, whether the whole issue is not largely one of "anti-labor agitation."

BASIC AIM

THE BASIC AIM OF THE CLOSED SHOP IS THE ESTABLISHMENT OF UNION MEMBERSHIP AS ONE OF THE BASIC CONDITIONS OF WORK.

The closed shop as it exists in the United States assumes many different forms. In some cases it means that a worker must be a union member before he can be hired for a certain job, and at times the employing has to be done through the union offices. Elsewhere it applies not to the hiring of men but to their status afterwards, requiring them to become union members within a certain period in order to retain their job. Or again, it may be no more than the agreement by the employer to give "preference" to union members in hiring and promoting. There is a great deal of leeway in the actual terms of the closed shop, since its provisions are the result of collective bargaining and will vary according to different conditions.

Whatever form it may take, the closed shop always contains one feature which is fundamentally the same. This is the claim that union membership is, or should be, one of the basic

¹ Since this article was written, eight more States have banned the closed shop. (Ed.)

* Center of Information Pro Deo, 5 Beekman St., New York 7, N. Y., March 1, 1947

conditions for work. Labor leaders point out that any job requires that certain conditions be met. There is first the ability to do the job, then the implicit agreement to accept and carry out the directions laid down by the foreman or production manager, the obligation to use the tools properly, the acceptance of certain deductions from wages for social security, and the like. To these conditions organized labor would add the obligation of being a union member. They maintain that in the organization of industrial society the trade union has come to be as essential as any of the other conditions which a man must meet in becoming an industrial worker. For this reason labor looks upon the closed shop as the natural outgrowth of the trade union movement and repels the efforts to ban it as an attack upon the labor movement itself.

RECOGNITION OF UNION

THE CLOSED SHOP BY MAKING ALL THE WORKERS WITHIN A PLANT UNION MEMBERS ASSURES RECOGNITION OF THE UNION AS THE WORKERS' ORGAN OF SELF-GOVERNMENT IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS.

Those now arguing for a ban on the closed shop claim that it is an abuse and extraneous to the American labor movement as such. They attack it, as is illustrated, for instance, by Senator Ball's remarks, as a form of slavery which takes away the freedom of both employer and worker.

Under that form of closed shop which requires that only union members may be hired, it is obvious that the employer is not free to hire whom he pleases. However, the basic principle of the closed shop requiring union membership once a job is accepted does not conflict with the employer's freedom in this respect. He may hire any man he chooses as long as that man joins the union after he has begun to work. Union membership in this case is a condition of the work and not of the hiring, and insofar as it is a restriction upon freedom, it falls upon the worker rather than the employer.

Labor leaders argue that the union might be considered a source of freedom rather than a restriction upon it. They point to the situation of labor before the rise of unions when the "free" worker was compelled to accept almost any conditions or go without work. Some of the more far-sighted leaders are beginning to place more emphasis upon the function of the union as an organ of self-government. Mr. Martin C. Kyne, Education Director of the CIO Retail-Wholesale Workers, recently wrote in *The Sign*: "Just as a man becomes a citizen through participating in the life of the community, so labor maintains, a man should become a union member through becoming a worker in a closed shop. . . . The union is the government of the workers for their affairs as workers, and

all the closed shop maintains is that every worker has an obligation to take part in that government."

The ideal of the closed shop is thus similar to that of the organized profession, which is exemplified best perhaps in the Bar Association for lawyers. Labor leaders often use this association as an example of a closed shop, especially the so-called "integrated bar," which requires membership of anyone desiring to practice law, sets the standards of the profession and generally "governs" the legal profession. While there are major differences, and lawyers often object to the comparison. It brings to the fore the ideal of the union as an organized profession establishing and maintaining the standards of its members.

FOSTERS DEMOCRACY

THE CLOSED SHOP, FUNCTIONING AS AN ORGAN OF SELF-GOVERNMENT, CAN BE A MEANS OF PROMOTING DEMOCRATIC LIBERTY SO LONG AS ITS OWN PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES REMAIN TRULY DEMOCRATIC.

Once it is admitted that union membership is one of the conditions of work in an industrial society, the question of "freedom" of the worker immediately passes to a different plane. It is no longer a question of the freedom of the worker to choose or refuse to become a union member, but rather one of the freedom of the worker within the union. However, the two questions tend to become confused in the "pro" and "con" over

the closed shop. Labor rightly feels in many cases that the opposition at bottom refuses to admit that unions are an essential part of our industrial system and is using the closed-shop ban as a means of weakening them. The opposition, on the other hand, points to the cases where unions have prevented applicants from becoming members and where union officials and policy are chosen by a minority clique or a dictator rather than by the democratic decision of the members. The form of closed shop which has come closest to an organization like the Bar Association in maintaining standards is ironically enough the object of most criticism. The skilled craftsmen, particularly in the building trades, have in the past practically controlled their labor market by dictating the terms of hire as well as the conditions of admission to their trade, and in doing so, they have sometimes practiced many kinds of discrimination.

Whatever economic excuse there may have been for such practices, it is apparent that they are abuses, and that in such cases the worker cannot in fact exercise democratic freedom within his union. Banning the closed shop, however, will not automatically eliminate such abuses any more than banning elections will get rid of the graft that is sometimes associated with them. As in the cases of the abuses of democracy, the best answer is to procure more and better democ-

racy. Labor leaders are aware of the problem; Mr. Kyne, in the article already cited, points out that the freedom of the worker within the union, as of the citizen within a democracy, is linked with the protection of minority rights. He notes that there should be an impartial board to handle complaints against union practices within any given plant and that the minority should have every opportunity "to work within the union to win adherents to their policy." Such an opportunity is, in fact, what is generally meant by democratic freedom.

The essential task then, as regards the abuses within the labor movement, is to obtain more genuinely democratic practices within the unions. In many cases, the abuses

arise because the membership is passive and takes little interest in union affairs. Another contributing cause has been the fact that the attention of labor leaders has been almost exclusively concerned with building up membership. With respect to both of these, the closed shop has been an aid rather than a hindrance, and to ban it outright might well intensify rather than lessen the abuses. As Senator Warren Magnuson pointed out in defending the closed shop on the "Town Meeting of the Air," Feb. 20: "Outlawing the closed shop does not cut to the fundamental causes of labor-management disputes." The need is rather to find a means to help labor help itself to secure democracy within all its unions.

Soviet Tyranny in Hungary

All defense lawyers in the trial of the alleged conspirators against the Hungarian Republic resigned today. They said they were being attacked constantly by the Leftist press as Fascists, and they asked that the court appoint official defenders in their place.

This is symptomatic of what has been going on in Budapest since the arrest of Mr. Kovacs [secretary-general of the Smallholders Party] by the Russians on the ground that he had conspired against the Russian occupation forces in Hungary. No one dares to open his mouth to protest against the undemocratic procedures by which the will of the Hungarian people is being defeated and a way being prepared for a dictatorship of the proletariat.—*John MacCormac in the NEW YORK TIMES, March 7, 1947.*

The Plot Against Hitler

ROBERT INGRIM

ON AUGUST 2, 1944, Winston Churchill said in the House of Commons:

As the war enters its final phase, it is becoming, and will become, increasingly less ideological. Confusion was caused in some minds by mixing ideology with idealism, whereas in fact there is quite a notable difference between them. While I cherish idealism as a cheerful light playing over the thoughts and hopes of men and inspiring noble deeds, ideology too often presents itself as an undue regimentation of ideas, and may very likely be incompatible with freedom.

It was the voice of a man who was struggling to regain his freedom. Thirteen days before, on July 20, something had happened in Germany which should have shattered the ideology of the Allies' political strategy.

Today the Hitler Plot is no longer a secret, and it is always easy to hold up to ridicule those who feel compelled by their profession to pass final judgments in a hurry. If I recall as typical the views of the *New York Times* and of the *New York Herald-Tribune*, I do so only in order to show how deeply many of us were ensnared in Soviet-sponsored ideology and terminology.

This is an excerpt from an article, "Ideological Fetters," contributed to the March issue of THOUGHT by the author of "After Hitler Stalin?" We regret that limitations of space do not permit us to reprint the entire article here.*

New York City's two leading papers offered the rare spectacle of complete harmony. Steeped in the doctrine that the "militarists" were even worse than Hitler, the two journals hardly hid their satisfaction that the attempt at the tyrant's life had failed. Clearly, a success would have exposed us to the danger of a compromise peace with the German generals! In several articles, the *Times* harped on the theme that the officers' hatred of Hitler was only inspired by the fear, lest, by his stubbornness, he destroy Germany's ability to wage another war. On July 22, 1944, the *Times* expressed the following thought:

We have been warned from the beginning that the Germans would try to avoid the just penalties for their collective sins by rejecting their old rulers and turning to new ones. If the day before yesterday the terms on which the

* Fordham University, New York 58, N. Y., March, 1947.

United Nations would end the war were the unconditional surrender and disarmament of all German forces and the occupation of Germany by Allied troops, those must still be the terms today.

Equally the *Herald-Tribune* of the same day: "No matter who negotiates the surrender of the armed forces of Germany and Japan, the surrender must be unconditional."

FURTHER REPORTS

When further reports showed the plotters against Hitler in a favorable light, both newspapers considered it necessary to rush in with disparagements. So the *Times* on July 24:

They (Hitler and Himmler) are now ruthlessly exterminating all real or suspected opposition in a new purge which is making Germany herself run red with blood and is filling her jails and concentration camps with some of those very same Junkers, nobles and militarists who thought to use the Nazis for their purposes.

This meant: It serves them right. Likewise the *Herald-Tribune* on August 1: "If Hitlerism has begun its last stand by destroying the militarist tradition, then it has been doing a large part of the Allies' work for them." Heil Hitler! But the climax was still to come. When the heroes of the great conspiracy had been put to death in a bestial manner, this was, on August 9, what America's best newspaper had to say:

The details of the plot suggest more the atmosphere of a gangster's lurid underworld than the normal atmosphere one

would expect within an officers' corps and a civilized government. For here were some of the highest officers of the German army—a field marshal, a former chief of the General Staff, a whole assortment of generals and other officers—plotting for a year to kidnap or kill the head of the German state and Commander in Chief of its army; postponing the execution of the plot repeatedly in order to kill his high executioner as well; and finally carrying it out by means of a bomb, the typical weapon of the underworld. . . . The underworld mentality and methods which the Nazis brought from their gutters and enthroned on the highest level of German life, have begun to pervade the officers' corps as well. . . . Their tragedy was that while they were willing to stoop to Nazi methods, they lacked the Nazi cunning to make effective use of them. And so they were hanged.

Better still the *Herald-Tribune*, also on August 9:

Americans as a whole will not feel sorry that the bomb spared Hitler for the liquidation of his generals. They hold no brief for aristocrats as such, especially those given to the goosestep, and when it connives with their convenience, to collaboration with low-born, mob-rousing corporals. Let the generals kill the corporal, or vice versa, preferably both.

Well, that was meant to squash the matter. The whole plot had by no means tallied with what Americans had been told for years by the makers of public opinion. Hence it had to be misinterpreted. Otherwise it would have been necessary to confess that the only serious opposition

against national socialism had come from the Right, not from the Left, from the junkers and generals, not from the proletarians.

Martyrs, however, have a way of coming back from their graves at the most inappropriate moments. Their quiet voices are louder than editorials and radio commentators. In October, 1945, the London *Contemporary Review* published an article which was too sensational to be mentioned in our newspapers. It was called "The Background of the Hitler Plot" and bore quite a good signature—that of the Bishop of Chichester. From what he reported, it emerged clearly that even liberals should have been able to suck some honey from the thistle if only they had been less hasty and a little more broadminded. Surely, those who had carried the plot into effect had mostly been high-ranking officers because they alone had had the opportunity to approach Hitler and to set force against force. But among the heads of the conspiracy there had been some important leaders of the old trade unions—something to show even for liberals!

In May of 1942—note the early date—the bishop, on a visit to Sweden, was informed of all the details by two German churchmen, Dr. Hans Schoenfeld and Pastor Dietrich Bonhoeffer. They spoke of three main groups of resistance: Actual and former members of state administration; former trade unionists; high officers

in all the military and police forces, and Church leaders. They developed the following program: A strongly decentralized, democratic Germany; reconstruction on "truly socialistic lines," instead of totalitarian self-sufficiency; European federation, including Great Britain, with a European army, based on the fundamental principles of Christian faith and life. They emphasized strongly that Germany had to atone for her sins and to repair the damage inflicted on Jews and other nations. They wanted to know whether Great Britain would encourage a rising against Hitler and, in case of success, would be willing to negotiate with the new government.

Pastor Bonhoeffer, known to the bishop "intimately" since 1933 "as an uncompromising anti-Nazi," gave him the names of the chief conspirators who would head the new government: Colonel General Beck, Chief of the General Staff before the invasion of the Sudetenland, which he had rejected; Colonel General von Hammerstein, Supreme Commander of the Army before Hitler, "a convinced Christian"; Karl Goerdeler, a former lord mayor of Leipzig, "highly esteemed by civil service people"; Wilhelm Leuschner, a Social Democrat who had been head of the united trade unions; Joseph Kaiser, a Catholic trade-union leader. Bonhoeffer described in detail the thorough and widespread organization, in

the ministries, in all big towns, especially in the armed forces. He mentioned the field marshals von Kluge and von Witzleben.

The two Germans asked the bishop to find out whether the Allies would be willing to treat with a *bona fide* government for such settlement as outlined above, including the withdrawal of all German forces from foreign soil. On June 30, 1942, the bishop informed Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden. On July 17, Eden told the bishop that the answer was no.

BISHOP'S REPORT CONFIRMED

In his conclusions, the bishop points out that that was not simply a conspiracy of officers. There were, he says, different kinds of people who, for various reasons, wanted to eliminate Hitler. There were, secondly, those whom he calls the "upholders of the European tradition in Germany," people who opposed the regime "from a definite Christian or liberal or democratic angle." To both groups "the army was indispensable for success."

Still more important is another remark. Ever since July 20, 1944, it has been the immutable habit of our press to describe those officers as men who would gladly have stood by Hitler if only he had kept on being victorious. The Bishop of Chichester refutes this theory: "I have shown that the Hitler plot was prepared at the latest in the winter of 1941-1942

when the Germans held 1,000 miles of Russian territory, and when nearly all Europe was occupied." Hence, at a time when London and Washington reckoned with Russia's complete collapse.

Actually the foundations of the plot were laid in 1940. . . . It is worth noting that those whose names were given as leaders in 1942, Beck, Goerdeler and others, were the leaders in 1944. It may also be recalled that this was not the first time that Beck and Goerdeler had made their opposition to Hitler known to the British government. Goerdeler came over to London in the summer of 1938, and again in 1939, informed the Foreign Office of Hitler's determination to go to war, and warned it that the only way to prevent war was by a very strong line against Hitler, and by being well prepared.

The bishop's report was recently confirmed and supplemented by a full and scholarly statement which appeared in the July, 1946, issue of *The American Historical Review* under the name of Franklin L. Ford who, as a member of the Office of Strategic Services, was ordered to study the history of the plot. During the Sudeten crisis, General Beck and all army group commanders—in other words, the whole German army—were just about to seize power and to jail and denounce the national socialist leaders as warmongers, when, one day before zero hour, Chamberlain and Daladier spoiled everything by announcing acceptance of Hitler's invitation to Munich. Verily, foreign

appeasers saved Hitler from "German junkers and militarists"—but the latter kept on working for his fall.

It would be interesting to learn whether Mr. Eden, in July, 1942, discussed Dr. Bonhoeffer's mission with Washington and what was Roosevelt's and Hull's attitude. The bishop's article and Mr. Ford's revelations imply a grave accusation, and those who were involved ought to feel the urge to reply. Was Roosevelt afraid of his liberals? Did Stalin use his veto? There is very little doubt that the plot would have succeeded if given some encouragement from abroad. In 1944, after many defeats, the conspiracy was much stronger than in 1942, but some army leaders kept aloof because they saw only the alternative of unconditional surrender. If shown a somewhat brighter prospect, they too would have joined the plot, and in that case nothing could have saved the national socialist regime. Our victory would have been swift and complete, without the destruction of Europe, without the triumph of Soviet imperialism.

This consideration may look like crying over spilt milk. In reality it is directly linked to the still existing fact that we have not yet been able to regain our own political terminology; that we are still entangled in an alien ideology. Caught in that net, we have done something which no nation can do without the greatest peril: We have broken the hearts and

cut the throats of our truest friends.

The Bishop of Chichester estimates that 20,000 Germans were executed after July 20, 1944. A horrifying statistic, but at the same time a great solace. When 20,000 died for being "the upholders of the European tradition in Germany," that tradition must have had very deep roots. The list of the outstanding victims of Hitler's revenge which was published by the *Times* reads like an excerpt from the Almanach de Gotha, and no wonder that Dr. Ley, the national socialist labor leader, had spoken of the "blue-blooded swine." But the majority of those 20,000 were hardly aristocratic. What our liberals would call the common man figured largely on the honor roll.

Of course, most of the leaders, admirals, ambassadors, field marshals and other generals, were very uncommon men. But that should only encourage us to deal with their likes. To blame a man for having attained a higher station in society, is not an American idea. Granted that a professor and a factory owner are more responsible for their political decisions than a truck driver and a coal miner, it should also be realized that it would have been easier for the latter to refuse enlistment in the national socialist party. Under the pressure of a totalitarian regime, the worker is less vulnerable than the employer, the driver less than the professor. To persecute the conspicu-

ous men and to pardon the lesser fry may sound quite reasonable, but is again in the spirit of a foreign ideology. This refers to both denazification and punishment of so-called collaborators. If workers are allowed to reverse their turned coats, that is; to rejoin the Communist party, nonworkers too must be allowed to convert or reconvert. Otherwise we keep on playing the game of Stalin.

LEARNING OUR LESSON

Much of the damage wrought by our acceptance of the Soviet terminology is irreparable, but the lesson need not be squandered. Surprisingly enough, we still have friends in the Old World if only for the reason that, compared with the East, we appear as the lesser evil. But on that we cannot rely indefinitely. Unrequited love easily turns bitter. Great forces are still in the process of shifting. If an army loses 100,000 men, the total loss is 100,000; if, however, 100,000 men go over to the enemy, the total loss is 200,000.

When the German field marshal Paulus, after his capture at Stalin-grad, started cooperation with the Soviets, some "experts" on Germany predicted a German-Russian coalition against the West. The Prussian generals, they said, had an old penchant for Russia. They recalled the Convention of Taurogen, of December 30, 1812, by which the Prussian gen-

eral Count Yorck von Wartenburg had led his troops from the French into the Russian camp, openly defying his king but well-deserving of the nation. Something similar would happen again, and then, woe to us! It did not turn out this way, but we could not claim the credit. The gloomy prophets had overlooked the fact that it had been one thing for German conservatives to side with a Russian czar against the French usurper, but that it would have been another thing to join Asia against Europe and her American daughter. Very significantly, among the plotters against Hitler who pinned their hopes on the West was a Yorck von Wartenburg.

The history of Europe can be described as an endless struggle against becoming an annex of Asia. Having allowed the Russians to annex Koenigsberg and to include Vienna and Weimar in their zone, we have done our utmost to undo two thousand years of European exertion. Our responsibility is terrifying. But the question where to go from here is still open to our own answer.

If we want to give the right one, our most urgent task is to purge ourselves of the terminology which has enslaved us. We know now that national socialism was exactly national socialism; that it was revolutionary, neither conservative nor reactionary. It was German bolshevism, just as

May
burg
ench
ying
the
hap-
! It
we
The
the
for
ith a
rench
been
ainst
hter.
otters
hopes
War-
n be
uggle
Asia.
o an-
clude
zone,
undo
n ex-
terrify-
to go
own
t one,
e our-
ch has
at na-
tional
onary,
onary.
ust as

bolshevism is Russian national socialism. It had nothing in common with traditional militarism. It was a near relative to Fascism which was the Italian and therefore the least brutal brand of national socialism.

Every day offers new opportunities to apply that dearly purchased discovery. If we are told, for instance, that we must not help General

Chiang-Kai-Shek against the Soviets because "reactionaries" are in his ranks, we know that everything is preferable to the totalitarian state. It seems that "reactionary" is the term destined by Soviet propagandists to take the place of the hoary "Fascist." Let us be on our guard. The opposite to "reactionary" is "progressive," and progress is quickest where the way goes down.

Problems of Peace

The goal we are all seeking is peace with a dependable basis for collective security. The United States Government will work with other nations to attain this goal as rapidly as possible. That is the first essential, I think, on the road to disarmament. It will not be a short road or an easy one. The international control of atomic energy with effective safeguards is of first importance. It is not a problem of disarmament in the conventional sense. Mankind can never feel secure so long as this great destructive force remains uncontrolled. That is why we are giving primary emphasis to solving the problem it presents. Also essential to the establishment of real security are solutions acceptable to the great powers of the tremendous issues which the peace settlement poses. It is difficult to see how any real disarmament, or even any substantial reduction of armaments, can take place until such solutions have been found.—U. S. Secretary of State George C. Marshall, Feb. 7, 1947.

THE EDITORIAL MIND

"Purge" in Hungary

SPURRED by the success of their comrades throughout eastern Europe, the Communists in Hungary have apparently embarked on a desperate campaign to seize control of that country before the Russian occupation army evacuates it under the new peace treaty scheduled to be signed soon. Though they polled only 17 per cent of the total vote, they have managed, with Russian backing, to dominate the coalition Government to which they were admitted and to get control of the police, both civil and military, which is their first objective in every country and their principal instrument for liquidating any opposition. With that weapon in their hands, they first proceeded to "purge" the Small Holders party, which had swept the country in the national election. Now they have gone over to arresting all potential opposition leaders in the Army, the Government and the majority party.

The arrests are justified by charges which are all too familiar from Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania and Poland. These charges are that the arrested leaders were engaged in a

"plot against the security of the Republic." According to the Communist-controlled Ministry of the Interior, they planned an armed uprising to restore Admiral Horthy to power after the Russians have left. But these charges refute themselves; for the peace treaty itself forbids any kind of fascist Government and that treaty is subject to Allied enforcement. The principal Communist organ frankly admits that the arrests and charges are designed to prevent the opposition from taking advantage of the "change of force and power positions after the signing of the treaty."

What is more ominous, but in keeping with what is happening throughout eastern Europe, the Hungarian Communists have now directed their fire against the men who also plotted against Hitler and played leading roles in creating the Government of Liberation and arranging the surrender of the country to Russia. Some of them had been sent to German concentration camps as leaders of the anti-German resistance. But if the Communists have their way, that will save them no more than a like fight saved their counterparts in neighboring coun-

tries. For they only fought for their country and those who only fought for their country are now being liquidated by those who fought only for Russia.—NEW YORK TIMES, *New York, N. Y., Jan. 10, 1947.*

Dignity of Work

IN Cincinnati several weeks ago a truck driver got mad because he saw a movie in which the heroine turned down a proposal of marriage from an extremely eligible bachelor with these biting words: "*Rather than be your wife, I'd even marry a truck driver.*"

Earl Quigley, a member of the Teamsters' Union (AFL), Local 100, decided to bring the matter up at his next union meeting. His fellow truck drivers greeted his remarks with thunderous applause and action. As a result the movie company got a blistering protest from Local 100, other unions also complained, and the teamsters began a program to educate their fellow Americans about truck drivers.

Work is glad to see a manual worker pinning back the ears of those pseudo-intellectuals who think that there is something inferior or undignified about doing heavy, manual work. Too many Americans, manual workers included, have acquired the hazy, crazy notion that white-collar work is "better" or "nobler" than manual labor. As a result we find

millions of American workers feverishly trying to trade their blue shirts for white ones. And their children, learning their father's frustrations, soon share the same opinions.

Our position has always been that manual work has a dignity, *provided* that the working conditions are just and fair; that manual work can be a vocation, *provided* the manual worker realizes the importance of his work to the community, to himself, to his family, and to the honor and glory of God; that manual work can be something to be proud of, *provided* it is done well and with responsibility that gives the workers a real voice in determining the conditions of employment.

To brother Quigley and his fellow truck drivers we say, without implying class consciousness:

Remember that 150 out of the British Labor Party's 400 members of parliament are manual workers, and they are all proud of it.—WORK, Chicago, Ill., February, 1947.

Teachers' Strikes

AMID the many deviations from ethical and moral standards which have marked the post-war era, it is still surprising to find that a considerable section of the teaching profession has been carried away by unsound reasoning in regard to the rights and obligations that belong to that profession. For teachers, after

all, spend their lives in the intellectual field; they train their pupils to think properly and to evaluate wisely, and their familiarity with those functions should, as a matter of course, guide them in their own lives. When they are made victims of economic injustice, as has unquestionably become a fact, they should know how to have the wrong redressed without abandoning the principles to which they owe loyalty; they should show special consideration for order and for the responsibility which each individual owes to the community, since the very existence of the schools demands respect on the part of the pupils for authority and for the common good.

In resorting to strikes to enforce their demands for higher wages—to which they are entitled—teachers claim they are only using methods which employes of industry have found necessary and successful; but they overlook a vital distinction. Workers in industry are hired by profit-making employers; the efforts and skill of these workers have as their prime purpose the acquisition of financial gain by the employers. There is no such relation at all between teachers and the work they perform; theirs is a public service, intended directly and principally to promote the common welfare. Entering that work, they accept its solemn obligations, which extend beyond the classroom; for they must be not

merely teachers but exemplars of clear thinking, upright conduct and good citizenship. Manifestly, it would be impossible for the community to adequately recompense teachers for services so important and so exacting, but assuredly they should not have to resort to strikes in order to obtain decent compensation. By all means teachers should be organized: not to threaten, and not to strike, but to educate the adults as well as the children of the community in the meaning of justice.—PITTSBURGH CATHOLIC, *Pittsburgh, Pa.*, March 6, 1947.

The Hunt After Pleasure

BALLROOMS, bars and amusement parks are over-crowded. From all over the world comes news that proprietors of such places cannot cope with the rush. The hunt for pleasure has reached fever pitch.

It would be pleasant to be able to say that this is a good sign, that after years of terror and austerity the world is gay again. But unfortunately this is nearly the reverse of the truth. The men and women who dance every night and many early mornings are not really happy. The steady drinkers in hotels and bars are quite sad people.

There are, of course, gay parties and happy dances, but they are not made up of people who have no other object in life than the pursuit of

pleasure. They are composed of those who look on amusements as a necessary break in the ordinary round of work and duty. They are composed of those who have something to do, who run or help to run a home or family, those with an interest in life, an ideal to fight for, an honest love to return or a vocation to follow. These and the men and women who are striving to live the full Christian life—these are the world's wise and happy people. They do not expect from earth what this earth was never meant to give. They know that their final goal is Heaven, and that they can never be completely satisfied with less. In the meantime, they are content: they have faith and hope and a lot of charity. And they have peace of soul.

But today there are millions who think of life as a succession of amusements unfortunately interrupted by intervals of necessary work and duty. They dislike the work and shirk the duty. Soon their days are divided into eight hours of boredom in office, home or factory, followed by six hours of disappointing excitement in

dancehall or bar, and then too few hours of exhausted sleep to prepare for another unsatisfactory day. These people have been misled into mistaking something else for happiness. Even the limited happiness we can enjoy here is a deeper, finer, quieter thing than the fuss and excitement that must go with this unrelieved pursuit of pleasure. The fact that so many fill their lives with this wild hunt for thrills and novelties is a clear indication that real happiness has passed them by. They have missed the ferry, and their wallah-wallah is heading the wrong way.

But besides the foolishness, frustration and final disillusionment of this kind of life, the pleasure-seeker, in surrendering so often to his appetite for enjoyment, finally increases that appetite so enormously that it will not be denied what is sinful. This is the moment when the creature turns against the Creator of all pleasure, and uses God's gift as a weapon of rebellion. That is the final danger of the unrestrained hunt after pleasure. — SUNDAY EXAMINER, *Hong Kong, China, Feb. 2, 1947.*



Emigration and Freedom

Man can no longer be free within the institutions of any given state if he is imprisoned within the frontiers of that state. He cannot be free unless he can move freely to any land anywhere on which he desires to build a house and love.—*C. G. Paulding in THE COMMONWEAL, April 4, 1947.*

The Jersey Bus Case

The text of the Supreme Court's decision, written by Mr. Justice Black and handed down on February 10, 1947, in the so-called New Jersey School bus case. Religious News Service.*

A NEW JERSEY statute authorizes its local school districts to make rules and contracts for the transportation of children to and from schools. The appellee, a township board of education, acting pursuant to this statute authorized reimbursement to parents of money expended by them for the bus transportation of their children on regular buses operated by the public transportation system. Part of this money was for the payment of transportation of some children in the community to Catholic parochial schools. These church schools give their students, in addition to secular education, regular religious instruction conforming to the religious tenets and modes of worship of the Catholic Faith. The superintendent of these schools is a Catholic priest.

The appellant, in his capacity as a district taxpayer, filed suit in a State court challenging the right of the Board to reimburse parents of parochial school students. He contended that the statute and the resolution passed pursuant to it violated both the State and the Federal Constitutions. That court held that the legislature was without power to author-

ize such payment under the State constitution (132 N. J. L. 98). The New Jersey Court of Errors and Appeals reversed, holding that neither the statute nor the resolution passed pursuant to it was in conflict with the State constitution or the provisions of the Federal Constitution in issue (133 N. J. L. 350). The case is here on appeal under 28 U. S. C. 344(a).

Since there has been no attack on the statute on the ground that a part of its language excludes children attending private schools operated for profit from enjoying state payment for their transportation, we need not consider this exclusionary language; it has no relevancy to any constitutional question here presented. Furthermore, if the exclusion clause had been properly challenged, we do not know whether New Jersey's highest court would construe its statutes as precluding payment of the school transportation of any group of pupils, even those of a private school run for profit. Consequently, we put to one side the question as to the validity of the statute against the claim that it does not authorize payment for the transportation generally

* Footnotes have been omitted.

of school children in New Jersey.

The only contention here is that the State statute and the resolution, in so far as they authorize reimbursement to parents of children attending parochial schools, violate the Federal Constitution in these two respects, which to some extent overlap. First. They authorize the state to take by taxation the private property of some and bestow it upon others, to be used for their own private purposes. This, it is alleged, violates the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Second. The statute and the resolution forced inhabitants to pay taxes to help support and maintain schools which are dedicated to, and which regularly teach, the Catholic Faith. This is alleged to be a use of State power to support church schools contrary to the prohibition of the First Amendment which the Fourteenth Amendment made applicable to the States.

PUBLIC PURPOSE SERVED

First. The due process argument that the state law taxes some people to help others carry out their private purposes is framed in two phases. The first phase is that a state cannot tax A to reimburse B for the cost of transporting his children to church schools. This is said to violate the due process clause because the children are sent to these church schools to satisfy the personal desires of their parents, rather than the public's in-

terest in the general education of all children. This argument, if valid, would apply equally to prohibit state payment for the transportation of children to any non-public school, whether operated by a church, or any other non-government individual or group. But, the New Jersey legislature has decided that a public purpose will be served by using tax-raised funds to pay the bus fares of all school children, including those who attend parochial schools. The New Jersey Court of Errors and Appeals has reached the same conclusion. The fact that a state law, passed to satisfy a public need, coincides with the personal desires of the individuals most directly affected is certainly an inadequate reason for us to say that a legislature has erroneously appraised the public need.

It is true that this Court has, in rare instances, struck down state statutes on the ground that the purpose for which tax-raised funds were to be expended was not a public one. *Loan Association v. Topeka*, 20 Wall. 655; *Parkersburg v. Brown*, 106 U. S. 487; *Thompson v. Consolidated Gas Utilities Corp.*, 300 U. S. 55. But the Court has also pointed out that this far-reaching authority must be exercised with the most extreme caution. *Green v. Frazier*, 253 U. S. 233, 240. Otherwise, a state's power to legislate for the public welfare might be seriously curtailed, a power which is a primary reason for the

existence of states. Changing local conditions create new local problems which may lead a state's people and its local authorities to believe that laws authorizing new types of public service are necessary to promote the general well-being of the people. The Fourteenth Amendment did not strip the states of their power to meet problems previously left for individual solution. *Davidson v. New Orleans* 96 U. S. 97. 103-104; *Barbier v. Connolly*, 113 U. S. 27, 31-32; *Fallbrook Irrigation District v. Bradley*, 164 U. S. 112, 157-158.

It is much too late to argue that legislation intended to facilitate the opportunity of children to get a secular education serves no public purpose. *Cochran v. Louisiana State Board of Education*, 281 U. S. 370; Holmes, J., in *Interstate Ry. v. Massachusetts*, 207 U. S. 79, 87. See opinion of Cooley, J., in *Stuart v. School District No. 1 of Kalamazoo*, 30 Mich. 69 (1878). The same thing is no less true of legislation to reimburse needy parents, or all parents, for payment of the fares of their children so that they can ride in public buses to and from schools rather than run the risk of traffic and other hazards incident to walking or "hitch-hiking." See *Barbier v. Connolly*, *supra*, at 31. See also cases collected 63 A. L. R. 413; 118 A. L. R. 806. Nor does it follow that a law has a private rather than a public purpose because it provides that tax-raised funds will be

paid to reimburse individuals on account of money spent by them in a way which furthers a public program. See *Carmichael v. Southern Coal & Coke Co.*, 301 U. S. 495, 518. Subsidies and loans to individuals such as farmers and home owners, and to privately owned transportation systems, as well as many other kinds of businesses, have been commonplace practices in our state and national history.

Insofar as the second phase of the due process argument may differ from the first, it is by suggesting that taxation for transportation of children to church schools constitutes support of a religion by the state. But if the law is invalid for this reason, it is because it violates the First Amendment's prohibition against the establishment of religion by law. This is the exact question raised by appellant's second contention, to consideration of which we now turn.

Second. The New Jersey statute is challenged as a "law respecting the establishment of religion." The First Amendment, as made applicable to the states by the Fourteenth, *Murdock v. Pennsylvania*, 319 U. S. 105, commands that a state "shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." These words of the First Amendment reflected in the minds of early Americans a vivid mental picture of conditions and practices which they fervently wished

to stamp out in order to preserve liberty for themselves and for their posterity. Doubtless their goal has not been entirely reached; but so far has the Nation moved toward it that the expression "law respecting the establishment of religion," probably does not so vividly remind present-day Americans of the evils, fears, and political problems that caused that expression to be written into our Bill of Rights. Whether this New Jersey law is one respecting the "establishment of religion" requires an understanding of the meaning of that language, particularly with respect to the imposition of taxes. Once again, therefore, it is not inappropriate briefly to review the background and environment of the period in which that constitutional language was fashioned and adopted.

REVIEWING THE BACKGROUND

A large proportion of the early settlers of this country came here from Europe to escape the bondage of laws which compelled them to support and attend government favored churches. The centuries immediately before and contemporaneous with the colonization of America had been filled with turmoil, civil strife and persecutions, generated in large part by established sects determined to maintain their absolute political and religious supremacy. With the power of government supporting them, at various times and places, Catholics had per-

secuted Protestants, Protestants had persecuted Catholics, Protestant sects had persecuted other Protestant sects, Catholics of one shade of belief had persecuted Catholics of another shade of belief, and all of these had from time to time persecuted Jews. In efforts to force loyalty to whatever religious group happened to be on top and in league with the government of a particular time and place, men and women had been fined, cast in jail, cruelly tortured, and killed. Among the offenses for which these punishments had been inflicted were such things as speaking disrespectfully of the views of ministers of government-established churches, non-attendance at those churches, expressions of non-belief in their doctrines, and failure to pay taxes and tithes to support them.

These practices of the old world were transplanted to and began to thrive in the soil of the new America. The very charters granted by the English Crown to the individuals and companies designated to make the laws which would control the destinies of the colonials authorized these individuals and companies to erect religious establishments which all, whether believers or non-believers, would be required to support and attend. An exercise of this authority was accompanied by a repetition of many of the old world practices and persecutions. Catholics found themselves hounded and proscribed be-

cause of their faith; Quakers who followed their conscience went to jail; Baptists were peculiarly obnoxious to certain dominant Protestant sects; men and women of varied faiths who happened to be in a minority in a particular locality were persecuted because they steadfastly persisted in worshipping God only as their own consciences dictated. And all of these dissenters were compelled to pay tithes and taxes to support government-sponsored churches whose ministers preached inflammatory sermons designed to strengthen and consolidate the established faith by generating a burning hatred against dissenters.

These practices became so commonplace as to shock the freedom-loving colonials into a feeling of abhorrence. The imposition of taxes to pay ministers' salaries and to build and maintain churches and church property aroused their indignation. It was these feelings which found expression in the First Amendment. No one locality and no one group throughout the Colonies can rightly be given entire credit for having aroused the sentiment that culminated in adoption of the Bill of Rights' provisions embracing religious liberty. But Virginia, where the established church had achieved a dominant influence in political affairs and where many excesses attracted wide public attention, provided a great stimulus and able leadership for the move-

ment. The people there, as elsewhere, reached the conviction that individual religious liberty could be achieved best under a government which was stripped of all power to tax, to support, or otherwise to assist any or all religions, or to interfere with the activities of any religious individual or group.

THE VIRGINIA STATUTE

The movement toward this end reached its dramatic climax in Virginia in 1785-86 when the Virginia legislative body was about to renew Virginia's tax levy for the support of the established church. Thomas Jefferson and James Madison led the fight against this tax. Madison wrote his great Memorial and Remonstrance against the law. In it, he eloquently argued that a true religion did not need the support of law; that no person, either believer or non-believer, should be taxed to support a religious institution of any kind; that the best interest of a society required that the minds of men always be wholly free; and that cruel persecutions were the inevitable result of government-established religions. Madison's Remonstrance received strong support throughout Virginia, and the Assembly postponed consideration of the proposed tax measure until its next session. When the proposal came up for consideration at that session, it not only died in committee, but the Assembly en-

acted the famous "Virginia Bill for Religious Liberty" originally written by Thomas Jefferson. The preamble to that Bill stated among other things that

"Almighty God hath created the mind free; that all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burthens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the Holy author of our religion who being Lord both of body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercions on either. . . ; that to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical; that even the forcing him to support this or that teacher of his own religious persuasion, is depriving him of the comfortable liberty of giving his contributions to the particular pastor, whose morals he would make his pattern. . . ."

And the statute itself enacted

"That no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened, in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief. . . ."

This Court has previously recognized that the provisions of the First Amendment, in the drafting and adoption of which Madison and Jef-

erson played such leading roles, had the same objective and were intended to provide the same protection against governmental intrusion or religious liberty as the Virginia statute. *Reynolds v. United States*, supra at 164; *Watson v. Jones*, 13 Wall. 679; *Davis v. Beason*, 133 U.S. 333, 342. Prior to the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment, the First Amendment did not apply as a restraint against the states. Most of them did soon provide similar constitutional protections for religious liberty. But some states persisted for about half a century in imposing restraints upon the free exercise of religion and in discriminating against particular religious groups. In recent years, so far as the provision against the establishment of a religion is concerned, the question has most frequently arisen in connection with proposed state aid to church schools and efforts to carry on religious teachings in the public schools in accordance with the tenets of a particular sect. Some churches have either sought or accepted state financial support for their schools. Here again the efforts to obtain state aid or acceptance of it have not been limited to any one particular faith. The state courts, in the main, have remained faithful to the language of their own constitutional provisions designed to protect religious freedom and to separate religions and governments. Their decisions, however, show the difficulty

in drawing the line between tax legislation which provides funds for the welfare of the general public and that which is designed to support institutions which teach religion.

EARLIER DECISIONS

The meaning and scope of the First Amendment, preventing establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, in the light of its history and the evils it was designed forever to suppress, have been several times elaborated by the decisions of this Court prior to the application of the First Amendment to the states by the Fourteenth. The broad meaning given the Amendment by these earlier cases has been accepted by this Court in its decisions concerning an individual's religious freedom rendered since the Fourteenth Amendment was interpreted to make the prohibitions of the First applicable to state action abridging religious freedom. There is every reason to give the same application and broad interpretation to the "establishment of religion" clause. The interrelation of these complementary clauses was well summarized in a statement of the Court of Appeals of South Carolina, quoted with approval by this Court in *Watson v. Jones*, 13 Wall. 679, 730: "The structure of our government has, for the preservation of civil liberty, rescued the temporal institutions from religious interference. On the other

hand, it has secured religious liberty from the invasions of the civil authority."

The "establishment of religion" clause of the First Amendment means at least this: Neither a state nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or to remain away from church, against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or non-attendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a state nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect "a wall of separation between Church and State." *Reynolds v. United States*, supra at 164.

We must consider the New Jersey statute in accordance with the foregoing limitations upon state law imposed by the First Amendment. But we must not strike that state statute

down if it is within the state's constitutional power even though it approaches the verge of that power. See *Interstate Ry. v. Massachusetts*, Holmes, J., *supra* at 85, 88. New Jersey cannot consistently with the "establishment of religion clause" of the First Amendment contribute tax-raised funds to the support of an institution which teaches the tenets and faith of any church. On the other hand, other language of the amendment commands that New Jersey cannot hamper its citizens in the free exercise of their own religion. Consequently, it cannot exclude individual Catholics, Lutherans, Mohammedans, Baptists, Jews, Methodists, Non-believers, Presbyterians, or the members of any other faith, because of their faith, or lack of it, from receiving the benefits of public welfare legislation. While we do not mean to intimate that a state could not provide transportation only to children attending public schools, we must be careful, in protecting the citizens of New Jersey against state-established churches, to be sure that we do not inadvertently prohibit New Jersey from extending its general state law benefits to all its citizens without regard to their religious belief.

Measured by these standards, we cannot say that the First Amendment prohibits New Jersey from spending tax-raised funds to pay the bus fares of parochial school pupils as a part

of a general program under which it pays the fares of pupils attending public and other schools. It is undoubtedly true that children are helped to get to church and schools. There is even a possibility that some of the children might not be sent to the church schools if the parents were compelled to pay their childrens' bus fares out of their own pockets when transportation to a public school would have been paid for by the State. The same possibility exists where the state requires a local transit company to provide reduced fares to school children including those attending parochial schools, or where a municipally owned transportation system undertakes to carry all school children free of charge. Moreover, state-paid policemen, detailed to protect children going to and from church schools from the very real hazards of traffic, would serve much the same purpose and accomplish much the same result as state provisions intended to guarantee free transportation of a kind which the state deems to be best for the school children's welfare. And parents might refuse to risk their children to the serious danger of traffic accidents going to and from parochial schools, the approaches to which were not protected by policemen. Similarly, parents might be reluctant to permit their children to attend schools which the state had cut off from such general government services as ordinary

police and fire protection, connections for sewage disposal, public highways and sidewalks. Of course, cutting off church schools from these services, so separate and so indisputably marked off from the religious function, would make it far more difficult for the schools to operate. But such is obviously not the purpose of the First Amendment. That Amendment requires the state to be a neutral in its relations with groups of religious believers and non-believers; it does not require the state to be their adversary. State power is no more to be used so as to handicap religions, than it is to favor them.

This Court has said that parents may, in the discharge of their duty under state compulsory education laws, send their children to a religious

rather than a public school if the school meets the secular educational requirements which the state has power to impose. See *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, 268 U.S. 510. It appears that these parochial schools meet New Jersey's requirements. The State contributes no money to the schools. It does not support them. Its legislation, as applied, does no more than provide a general program to help parents get their children, regardless of their religion, safely and expeditiously to and from accredited schools.

The First Amendment has erected a wall between church and state. That wall must be kept high and impregnable. We could not approve the slightest breach. New Jersey has not breached it here.



Full Production

It is idle to speak of stable social order in a nation, if that sum total of goods and conveniences is not produced that is necessary to meet the legitimate needs of all, particularly in a country such as ours, in which resources and technical equipment are fully capable of producing this total. Restriction of output below this volume, whether practised by giant corporations to make higher profits, or by trade unions to spread available work, cannot but add to human suffering and even contribute to lawlessness, and the breakdown of public order.—*Bishop Haas to the Family Life Conference, Chicago, Ill., March 11, 1947.*

Cinematography—A Liberal Art

ANATOLE G. LINDSAY

*Reprinted from THE SCIENCE COUNSELOR**

IN THIS paper I shall limit myself to the role and place of one of the liberal arts in the Catholic educational system, namely the art of cinematography.

Motion pictures, as yet, have not been widely recognized by our schools as an art, and they have not taken a place in the curriculum similar to that now occupied by literature, music and other liberal arts. Many other countries have already included cinematography in their school curricula.

Since long ago, particularly in French schools, the study of the Theatre has been on a parity with the teaching of literature. Russia has a special University of Cinematography. Germany and Italy had one like that under Mussolini and Hitler. The League of Nations had an International Institute of Educational Cinematography. These countries realized the tremendous propaganda power and the spiritual as well as the intellectual influence of motion pictures upon people. Since it is true that the totalitarian countries have seen the power of the motion picture for their propaganda purposes, how much more we in a democracy should give intelligent thought to

the subject of the use of motion pictures for educational purposes and character building. Very often the same instruments can be used for good as well as for evil, for life as well as death.

In our country, unfortunately, there are still many people who deny cinematography a place among the arts; this in spite of the fact that to produce motion pictures all liberal arts are called to cooperate and participate and to fuse and give birth to this new form of art. Their objection is that the motion picture cannot be art because it is produced by mechanical means, such as the camera and celluloid. If this were a valid reason, then we would not have any liberal arts at all. Indeed, in order to paint we need a brush and colors; in order to write we need a pen or typewriter and paper; in order to compose music we need paper and pen; in order to play music we need instruments, and so on. The material means used to embody the spiritual and intellectual thoughts varies according to the different arts.

Another reason sometimes advanced to deny cinematography its place among the liberal arts is that as yet no product probably is worthy

* Duquesne University Press, Pittsburgh, Pa., December, 1946

of that name. Here again the reason is not valid. Motion pictures are only the product of cinematography and not cinematography itself. The fact that the product is not artful is not proof that this art does not exist. Even if all the books ever written were bad, there would still be, abstractly speaking, such a thing as literature, and all that would be needed to make it apparent would be just one good book. At least one good film, everyone will agree, has already been produced.

A POWERFUL MEDIUM

Even if, in spite of these facts, there are still Catholic educators who would not agree that cinematography is a liberal art, nevertheless I hope they will agree that motion pictures have a place in the Catholic school curriculum. As a matter of fact, with a few exceptions, most diocesan superintendents of schools favor and advocate the use of motion pictures. The resistance, if any, does not come from the reluctance and unwillingness on the part of teachers to give motion pictures a place in the school curriculum, but from the plain fact that 16mm. sound equipment is still too high in cost, and some schools do not have the necessary funds to acquire it.

There is little doubt today that motion pictures are a powerful medium for the propagation of ideas. Indeed, not only the instructional

films, but even and perhaps more so, entertainment films in some way or other express a definite philosophy and are built upon certain values. The entertainment films can be Christian or non-Christian in their phases; can be in agreement or disagreement with the Divine moral laws and with the established social, historical or economical order.

Too often, unfortunately, people think only of instructional films when talking of the field of education. While the former, as their name indicates, are more pertinent to the field of scientific knowledge, the latter are of the utmost influence as far as our spiritual, moral and social life is concerned.

In many countries the potentiality of motion pictures as a medium of influencing and directing the trend of thought of the people in one direction or another have been fully realized.

Of course, we do not want to limit and discipline our children and our people into a regimented train of thought; however, we have to remember that any theatrical film expresses, condones or condemns some phase or philosophy of life, and that in almost any one of them there are moral values and moral issues involved.

This creates a serious problem of educational responsibilities on the part of our schools and educators. The time has come when a special

motion picture program and a special course in appreciation of motion pictures should be introduced into our educational system. Such a course can and probably should include the study of the history and development of motion pictures; in other words, it should be a course somewhat similar to our present one in literature.

It is a matter of common knowledge that many things are shown on the screen which are in direct contradiction with the teachings of Christianity. Insofar as the frequent viewing of such things on the screen may constitute a danger to one's Faith, we may call this danger ideological. However, another matter to consider is the tendency of many European countries to produce movies that have "social significance." In Russia every movie must directly or indirectly further the Soviet program. In Germany films were extensively used to further Nazi ideology. In France and England more movies with social significance are being produced. So far, movie producers

in this country have been fearful of taking this step, although several such films have already been produced and others imported. It is a reasonable assumption that in the future an attempt will be made to produce such pictures in this country. If this happens, we can be sure they will lean toward Communism rather than away from it.

Now all this leads to the conclusion that the time has come when motion pictures should be recognized by our schools as an art, and should be treated as such; when our teachers should assume the responsibility of training our children—the adults of tomorrow—to react not only emotionally, but also rationally, toward the pictures they see. Above all, we must train these "parents of tomorrow" to detect fallacious theories or principles, and to recognize the good ones involved in the pictures they see, by projecting and testing such theories and principles against the background of Catholic teaching and ideals.

Lost Opportunity

If, as soon as hostilities ceased, the politicians of all countries had turned their efforts to internationally planned reconstruction, instead of continuing the war on another plane in the illusion that the victors would gain a greater prosperity the more complete the ruin of the defeated, the economy of Europe (and hence that of Britain) would present another picture today.—*From PEOPLE & FREEDOM, London, England, Feb. 15, 1947.*

A Martyr's Page in Chinese History

*CIP Press Service**

THE steady growth of the Church in modern China, so frequently spotlighted by such events as Chiang Kai-Shek's publicly expressed appreciation of the Catholic missions, by the creation of a Chinese Cardinal, by the travels and speeches of Bishop (now Archbishop) Paul Yu-Pin of Nanking and by the recent exchange of representatives between the Vatican and China, has not, however, been accomplished without the blood of martyrs. This fact was signally emphasized on November 24, 1946, when there were beatified at Rome a small group of foreign and native Chinese missionaries who had been executed by the fanatical "Boxers" in the first year of this century.

1900 was a truly terrible year in Chinese history. It was a nightmarish year in an era of turmoil and discontent, which ushered out the disintegrating Manchu dynasty and gave birth to the republican government of 1912. China had lost Korea to Japan in 1895; the partition of the Chinese empire was under consideration by Western powers; and two violently opposed parties were crowding the Chinese stage with their contradictory policies for the salvation of China. From this fundamental division came forth the Boxers.

The Boxers—young men from 12 to 16 years of age, painted with rouge and wearing a handkerchief of the same color as a head dress—took the side of the Empress, known as Old Buddha, who, fearful for her country and filled with hate for everything Western and foreign, determined upon the extermination of foreigners. She believed that the East and the West had nothing in common, and thus she stood diametrically opposed to the belief of those who saw the salvation of China in the adoption of the customs and culture of the Occident. To carry out her plan she enlisted the aid of the Boxers, recognizing them as a regular army, entrusting to them the fate of the dynasty, proclaiming them the faithful servants of proven valor and sent by heaven to wreak vengeance on all foreigners in the country.

This imperial act set loose upon China, especially the northeastern provinces, a senseless, fanatical and impressionable mob of anti-Christians who indulged in the burning of churches and the murder of missionaries out of a sadistic hate for the spread of the Church and the consequent weakening of their own pagan superstitions. They accused the Church of being the cause of famines

and floods; they considered converts no longer citizens of the Empire, but degenerate, degraded beings, objects of scorn and contempt for their countrymen; they painted Christians as enemies of the gods, and charged them with provoking by their impieties the wrath of heaven.

For a year the Boxers struck terror in China. News of murders committed by the Boxers spread everywhere; they sang about their victories; they shouted forth the names of destroyed communities. Where these forces attacked Christian villages, they were followed by a nameless mob of assassins and plunderers. Thus the Boxers were mustered to exterminate the Catholic religion and its representatives. Their crimes and depredations were especially fierce and numerous in Northern and Southern Shansi where they enjoyed the favor of two Imperial Viceroys, Lipin-Hen and Yu-Hsien.

DIED FOR THE FAITH

The latter clearly revealed his intentions and his sympathies in his proclamations: "The European religion is cruel; it despises the spirits and tyrannizes over the people. Sack, murder and pillage are impending from the Boxers." In another ultimatum: "The Boxers, up to the present, have not killed the good and the bad indiscriminately; their anger is vented only against the Christians; I command all to obey my orders,

and men especially chosen for the work of enforcement are being dispatched in all directions to search out defaulters."

From these promulgations it is clear that those who died in the massacre, which followed in a few days, were put to death for their loyalty to the faith that was in them. On the night of July 5, an official of the viceroy Yu-Hsien, arrested the Bishop of Northern Shansi, Gregory Grassi, and his Co-adjutor, Bishop Francis Mary Fogolla and twenty-four others, including seven sisters of the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary. This small group, mainly French and Italian, with two nuns from Belgium and Holland and three Chinese seminarians, were kept in prison for several days. On July 9, at four o'clock in the afternoon, the emissaries of Yu-Hsien marched to the prison.

Seeing the Christians, who had heard them coming, kneeling in silence, they stood for a moment surprised, but in a few seconds they threw themselves upon their victims, struck them, and having tied their hands, drove them outside to the tribunal where the Viceroy made them kneel before him. Then in a rage he said to the Co-adjutor, whom he knew: "How many years have you been in China?"

"More than thirty."

"Why have you done harm to my people and for what reason have you propagated your religion?"

"We have done harm to no one, but we have done good to many."

"That is not true," shouted Yu-Hsien, "you have done evil to many of my people and for that reason you shall all be killed."

"If you kill us," replied the Bishop, "your crime will not go unpunished."

At this reply the Viceroy, beside himself with rage, sprang forward and struck the Bishop twice on the chest crying out to the soldiers: "Kill them all."

Hardly had the order been given than the soldiers and Boxers threw themselves upon the victims nearest at hand, striking at hazard, cutting off heads and limbs, and thus, in an

instant, they had killed all. Then they discharged their guns to chase away the spirits.

In the city of Tsinganfu, in the province of Shansi, is a monument, dedicated on March 24, 1903, in the then court of the prison, which perpetuates the memory of the heroism and devotion of this group of Catholics so recently beatified in Rome. An inscription, written in Latin and Chinese and carrying the Coats of Arms of the two Bishops and the seal of the Franciscan Order, lists the names of the martyrs, adding simply "Who were unjustly put to death, July 9, 1900."



Man in Society

The proper goal of man is to make the most he can out of himself. Or, to put it another way, his purpose in living is to perfect his own nature. But a man cannot perfect his will without political liberty. He cannot perfect his mind without education. He cannot perfect his body without proper food, clothes, exercise, rest, and medical care. He cannot perfect his whole personality without a certain amount of private property which he can do with as he wants. He certainly cannot perfect his heart and soul without free access to the truths about God. He cannot, in short, perfect himself as a democratic citizen without the basic guaranties of political, economical, physical, and spiritual liberty.—*Clare Boothe Luce, Lincoln Day Dinner, Winston-Salem, N. C., Feb. 15, 1947.*

Education for Tolerance

JULIAN J. REISS

Address delivered at the Sixth Annual Teachers' Institute, Catholic School Department, Diocese of Buffalo, Buffalo, N. Y., October 11, 1946.

LAST May, a young Negro woman came to the United States Employment Service in Amsterdam, N. Y., and applied for work as a hand sewer. She was referred to a tailoring and cleaning establishment which employed about twenty people, mostly women of Italian descent. She was well qualified and had an excellent experience in this field. The manager of the company employed her.

When he introduced her to his other employes, there was an immediate flare-up of resistance. They would not work with a Negro girl. The proprietor appealed to the manager of the United States Employment Service who came to the cleaning establishment himself in an endeavor to adjust the situation. He used every possible appeal to the workers but all of his efforts were without avail. They remained adamant.

Finally, as a last resort, he asked them if they were Catholics. They said that they were. And he told them that he, too, was a Catholic. He then asked them if they would be willing to go to their confessors that evening and ask if it were not a mortal sin to bar this Negro woman

from an opportunity to earn her living. They ridiculed his statement but agreed to do this if only to show him that he was wrong. The following day, the manager of the United States Employment Service again met with them. They were contrite and penitent and said they had not realized that what they were doing was the same as trying to starve the Negro woman to death, and, with full knowledge of its seriousness, would be a mortal sin.

Very few Catholic employes have the slightest feeling that refusal on their part to allow a Negro to work beside them involves any moral turpitude. Catholic employers, with very few exceptions, feel that they have a perfect right under the ethics of their religion to bar qualified Negroes or Jews from employment because of their race or religion.

These Catholics acquired knowledge of the principles and obligations of their faith in a large measure from Catholic schools and colleges. They learn of their duty to attend Mass, receive the sacraments, of the marriage laws, of what constitutes a venial or mortal sin as far as dishonesty lies, birth control, and all of the other transgressions of the

law of God, but they do not learn that the injustice which is done to whole groups of people by prejudice and discrimination is also a sin.

SINFULNESS OF PREJUDICE

If you were to ask what the Catholic school teacher can do, I would say first and foremost that it is to teach the sinfulness of prejudice and discrimination because of origin, class or color. The Fifth Commandment, which forbids injuries to our neighbors, forbids as well the appalling injuries which our prejudices and acts of discrimination cause whole groups of our neighbors.

Because of such prejudices, the Negro people are limited to the most menial types of work and are even paid less than others in such capacities. Fathers are not able to support their children. Mothers must go out and work. Children are left without guidance. Boarders must be taken in. Morals are impaired. Then we, blind and indifferent to the injuries inflicted by our prejudices, accuse these people of an inherent moral inferiority.

The rash judgment forbidden by the Eighth Commandment includes as well that rash judgment which consigns millions of our neighbors to poverty and squalor. The capital sin of pride includes as well that false race pride which commits whole segments of our population to a role of inferiority. And the capi-

tal sin of envy has for its opposite virtue, brotherly love, which includes the love of all mankind irrespective of race.

The sinfulness of prejudice and discrimination is predicated upon the actual truth of the equality of mankind. Many of us accept this equality in theory but there is a reluctance to accede to it in fact. This quality must become crystal clear to our students through the various courses we teach.

The course which especially emphasizes such equality is our Christian Doctrine. Here we learn in the very first page of Holy Scripture, with beautiful simplicity, how God as a culmination to his creative work made man to His own image and likeness, endowing him with supernatural gifts and privileges and destining him to eternal and ineffable happiness. All mankind, therefore, are identical in origin, dignity and destiny.

The Old Testament and the words of Our Saviour in the New Testament attest again and again to the brotherhood of all men under the fatherhood of God. Consider, if you will, Our Lord's prayer (John 17, 21);

Yet not for these only do I pray, but for those also who through their word are to believe in Me, that all may be one, even as thou, Father, in me and I in thee; that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.

Thus Our Lord tells us of the Mystical Body of Christ wherein all men are one in Christ so that, as St. Paul says, "There is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither slave nor freeman; there is neither male nor female" (and certainly neither black nor white). "For you are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3, 28).

Again and again St. Paul attests to the oneness of the human race. We have, too, the encyclicals. In *Rerum Ecclesiae* (on the foreign missions), Pope Pius XI says, concerning a native clergy;

He errs grievously who considers such natives as of an inferior race and obtuse intelligence. For long experience has shown that the peoples who inhabit the remote regions of the east and of the south frequently are not inferior to us.

Consider, if you will, a quotation from the *Summi Pontificatus*, encyclical letter on human unity of Pope Pius XII, anent the law of love, that law of human solidarity and charity which is dictated and imposed by our common origin and by the equality of rational nature in all men, to whatever people they belong, and by the redeeming Sacrifice offered by Jesus Christ on the Altar of the Cross to His Heavenly Father on behalf of sinful mankind.

How beautifully our Christian doctrine teaches us the equality of mankind.

This equality is clearly evidenced again when the bell rings for our class in civics, for again on the very first page we find our Declaration of Independence:

... We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed, by their Creator, with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men . . .

Consider the irreparable harm which is done when our practices do not conform with our principles. A young colored convert to the Catholic Faith who had learned of his obligation to attend Mass happened to be in a community in the South where there was only a white Catholic church. He waited until all of the congregation was assembled and then he crept into the back of the church not wishing to offend. He was spotted. The Mass was stopped and he was ordered out of the church with those cruel words "Get out of here, you nigger." How could a lesson in brotherly love possibly be taught from the pulpit of that church?

This is indeed shocking. You might say that it could never happen here. But when we bar a qualified Negro from admission to a Catholic school or college, we do have a practice which is not too dissimilar.

During the course of my work, I have talked to colored Catholic parents whose children have been barred from our schools, and the jagged wounds in their hearts have been laid bare before me, wounds that have been inflicted by the daggers of our

prejudice. Here is a young colored girl, a brilliant scholar, for whom her cultured parents had the highest aspirations—the first Negro to graduate from one of our diocesan high schools. She applied for admission to a Catholic college. She was given every indication of acceptance until she called personally. They could not accept Negroes. Disillusioned and wounded she applied to another Catholic college. Here she was told that they would accept her if she would register as Spanish. This she could not do. She said that she could not be a party to such hypocrisy.

She went to a non-Catholic college and her faith, withered by our prejudice, blighted by our racist heresy, died. When we look on the Cross and see the price which Our Lord paid to bring that precious gift of faith to her, our guilt can only stagger our consciences with its frightfulness. What hypocrisy it would be for these Catholic colleges to teach the Catholic principles of our common origin, dignity and destiny of mankind.

HOLY FATHER'S WARNING

You might say that this is an isolated case. The brother in charge of a Catholic high school made the statement the other day that he had to deny admission to nearly 50 colored boys during the past 10 or 12 years. This is the practice of so

many Catholic high schools and colleges. Need we wonder why our Catholic Faith appears like a stunted plant among the twelve million colored people in our midst?

Here is a young colored girl who in 1935 was converted to the Catholic Faith. She became a trained and registered nurse. She was very devout in her new Faith and became interested in joining a religious nursing society. She read a handbook on religious vocations and applied to at least fifteen nursing societies. Thirteen of them responded in a way that gave no room for doubt. She could not be considered because of her color. Thank God that her faith was strong enough to stand the onslaughts of our prejudice. Today, she is a member of the Servants for Relief of Incurable Cancer at Hawthorne, N. Y., caring for those whose repulsive, festering sores are a challenge to even the most heroic souls.

Here is a warning of our present Holy Father, the Pope, in his encyclical, *Summi Pontificatus*, against practices of this kind:

Those who enter the Church, whatever be their origin or their speech, must know that they have equal rights as children in the House of the Lord, where the law of Christ and the peace of Christ prevail.

There is no need for us to be fearful when we are guided by our Catholic principles. When Manhattanville College in 1938, under the wise guidance of the late Mother

Damman, first enrolled colored girls, they surmounted all difficulties. Mother Damman exercised the virtue of prudence in properly laying the ground for this step. But she did not consider that the virtue of prudence gave her a license to violate the law of God by barring Negro girls from a Catholic education.

Last year when Bishop Griffin of Trenton sent Father Thomas Jones, a Negro, as assistant pastor of St. Thomas' Church at Old Bridge, N. J., Father Jones was completely accepted by the all-white congregation. If there was any prejudice when he arrived, it soon faded away as a colored man, a priest of God, ministered unto them. When his Negro mother comes from Albany to visit him, members of the congregation vie with one another to have her as their guest.

This year, another Negro priest was appointed by Bishop Griffin to another all-white congregation, Corpus Christi parish, South River, New Jersey.

Monsignor James F. Kelly of Seton Hall College of South Orange, N. J., had the courage this fall to appoint a Negro, Dr. Francis M. Hammond, as head of the Department of Philosophy, and with Negro students being accepted there, we know that boys will not graduate from that college with prejudices against the Negro.

This fall, St. Joseph's College for

Women in Brooklyn appointed as an instructor on their staff, Miss Francis Douglas. They too, have accepted Negro students, and the girls who graduate from St. Joseph's will not harbor prejudices against the Negro.

When these steps are taken, there will be at times, perhaps, little tea-pot tempests emanating from the deep-seated prejudices of a few people, but should we, because of them, be hesitant to walk in the light of our Catholic principles and in the way Our Lord has shown us? Let us be mindful of the reproach of Our Lord to his apostles on the Sea of Galilee. "Why be fearful, O ye of little faith?"

Now may we turn to the class on economics. Having demonstrated so clearly, by teaching and example, the equality of mankind and the sinfulness of prejudice and discrimination, we can show here the benefits which would accrue if that equality becomes a living, vibrant reality in our economic life. Our economic progress is dependent upon the contributions made by all the people. Should we bar different groups from making the contributions of which they are capable, the whole economic body suffers. Listen to Eric Johnson:

The withholding of jobs and business opportunities from some people does not make more jobs and business opportunities for others. Such a policy merely tends to drag down the whole economic level. You can't sell an electric refrig-

erator to a family that can't afford electricity. Perpetuating poverty for some merely guarantees stagnation for all. True economic progress demands that the whole nation move forward at the same time. It demands that all artificial barriers erected by ignorance and intolerance be removed. To put it in the simplest terms, we are all in business together. Intolerance is a species of boycott and any business or job boycott is a cancer in the economic body of the nation. I repeat, intolerance is destructive; prejudice produces no wealth; discrimination is a fool's economy.

Consider, if you will, this one case. It involved a young colored boy who had just graduated from one of our high schools. He was a good scholar and also a good athlete. He played on the various track and basketball teams at his school. Here the boys all accepted him for what he was. After graduation this young colored boy, together with five of his white schoolmates, went to look for a job. They found just what they wanted,—positions as junior clerks—in a large company requiring high school diplomas. The bacculaureate sermon extolling the principles of equal opportunity in our country was still ringing in their ears! The five white boys were accepted, the one colored boy was rejected; the advertisement continued to appear in the paper. The pity of it was that this colored boy had just lost his father in the Pacific. And I can tell you that the five white boys were bitterly resentful of the injus-

tice done to their colored classmate.

Suppose you or I were this young colored boy. Would we not feel cynical with regard to the principles of our country? Would we not be attracted to the doctrines of communism which profess to accept all as equals? Perhaps in frustration we might even fall into delinquency and crime.

OBLIGATION OF GOVERNMENT

Your class in economics should have a clear understanding of the harm which is done to the economy of our country when injustices of this kind are allowed to persist, and of the obligation of government to take proper measures to correct these injustices. Pope Leo XIII in his encyclical on the condition of labor says: "Whenever the general interest of any particular class suffers, or is threatened with harm, which can in no other way be met or prevented, the public authority must step in and deal with it."

To correct these conditions, employers are asked only to hire, upgrade and retain in employment the best man for the job and not to judge the qualifications of applicants by their race, creed, color or national origin. Let your students answer the question whether that is too much to ask to rectify such a condition.

In closing, I would like to remind you of the words of Our Lord: "As long as you did it to one of these My least brethern, you did it to Me."

It is not hard to think of who among us is the least of Christ's brethren to receive justice. All others came to our land to find their freedom. The Negro people came to lose theirs as dejected, degraded slaves, thought at one time as without a soul in an effort for self-justification. When they were freed from the bonds of slavery, they were shackled to the chains of prejudice and discrimination.

A GOD-GIVEN RIGHT

How many times have we stood by the wayside and Our Lord has passed with His Cross in the person of our Negro brethren, worn, haggard and tired with a heart aching for a little sympathy or a little kindness, and we have stood indifferently by and we have shown Him none. But if we are inspired by our devotion to Christ to be charitable to our colored brethren, let us not forget that justice comes before charity, that we cannot deny him the opportunity to work, to live in decent homes, the spiritual benefits that flow from a Catholic education, and then offer him charity in their place. First, we must accept him in all ways as endowed with the full and equal dignity of our human nature. We must give him what he has a God-given right to and then

only then can we offer him charity if he still be in need.

Let us remember that the Catholic business man of tomorrow is in your hands today, and in teaching him the Catholic attitude toward his Negro brother, you are affording the Negro of tomorrow the right to work. The Catholic employe of tomorrow is in your hands today, and if he learns from you the Catholic attitude toward his Negro brother, he will not refuse to work by his side. The Catholic parents of tomorrow are in your hands today, and if they learn the Catholic attitude toward the Negro they will not hesitate to send their children to Catholic schools where Negroes are accepted or to hear Mass and receive the sacraments by their side. And indeed, the priest, the sister, the brother of tomorrow is in your hands today and if they learn from you now the Catholic attitude toward the Negro they will not hesitate to work by his side in the vineyard of Christ.

In doing this, through the children in your care today, you will be according justice, kindness—charity—and yes, the gift of our Catholic Faith to the Negro of tomorrow. And remember, "As long as you did it to one of these My least brethren, you did it to Me."

Missionaries Go Overseas

Reprinted from *The SHIELD**

THE *Saratoga* had not yet steamed for the first time under the Golden Gate Bridge at San Francisco, her vast deck swarming with servicemen back from the Pacific war theater. The *Queen Mary*, bringing soldiers from Europe, had not yet docked in New York harbor. But while these great ships were being readied for the return of American fighting men from the battle zones of World War II, other ships—little ships and some of them air ships—were transporting other groups of fighters by threes and fours and occasional dozens to other scenes of battle, less widely known.

These were not replacements for the Army and the Navy of the United States of America, but Catholic priests and religious going from America to missionary posts across the Atlantic and the Pacific and southward to Latin America. Some were returning to posts where they had worked before and from which they had been forced to return by governments at war. Some were returning after periods of recuperation from months or years of starvation in internment camps. Others were new missionaries, trained during the war in American seminaries or seasoned

by service as chaplains with the armed forces.

The figures on the enlistments in this postwar army have been compiled in the 1946 edition of *A Missionary Index of Catholic Americans*, a biennial book published by the Catholic Students' Mission Crusade.

The *Index* shows an increase of almost nine hundred Catholic American missionaries assigned to overseas missions since the year 1940, and, for most of the mission fields, there has been an increase since 1944. The actual figures are 3,093 for 1946, and 2,222 for 1940. However, there are four key countries across the Pacific which have fewer missionaries assigned to them now than they had two years ago. These countries are China, Japan, the Philippines and Korea.

China's number is almost one hundred less — 562 as compared with 659. It is true, of course, that the number of missionaries *active* in China two years ago was considerably less, but the decrease in the number of those *assigned* is important, in view of the fact that the Chinese Government is most anxious to have the help of Christian missionaries in the reconstruction of the country.

Readers of *THE SHIELD* will re-

* Crusade Castle, Shattauc Ave., Cincinnati 26, Ohio, Nov., 1946

member (October, 1945, "China's Future and America's") the words of Dr. Chu Chia-hua, Minister of Education:

We must welcome missionary schools, first because all of us educated Chinese owe them our modern education and, secondly, because China still has a long way to go in her plan of education . . . For a long time to come we will need the assistance of foreign educationalists and mission schools, and as long as I live I shall continue to foster such cooperation.

About Japan, Bishop Michael J. Ready, former Executive Secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, reported, on his return from an inspection in July: "Not since the days of St. Francis Xavier have the prospects for the Church been so sanguine." In spite of the remembrance of the war, Japanese Christians look to America to help them build up the religious spirit of the people. But there are only thirty Catholic American missionaries in Japan today.

A SAD PICTURE

The picture in the Philippines, as painted by the Rev. William F. Masterson, S. J., in *THE SHIELD* of last December ("Wake of War in the Philippines") was this: "At the outbreak of the war, slightly more than 1,400 priests were trying to minister to over 12,800,000 Catholics. . . . Of these, less than 200 were from America, while something above 800 were native and 400 from

Europe." The number from America is now 217.

As for Korea, it has been pointed out that this country, with 200,000 Catholics out of a population of 23,000,000, is a point of strategy for spreading the Catholic Faith in the Orient. The number of Catholic American missionaries in Korea, in mid-1946, was seven.

The Jesuits (eight provinces) have the largest number of men in foreign missions at the present time. Their number, as reported in the *Index*, is 384 divided into 11 mission fields. The Maryknoll Missioners are second among the mission societies of men, with 264 in 12 fields.

Among the Sisters, first place is taken by the Franciscans, representing many different communities and some whose names do not commonly denote the Franciscan rule of life. American Sisters of known Franciscan affiliation in the foreign missions number 336, working in 15 fields. The Maryknoll Sisters are second, with 198 in six fields. The Maryknoll Sisters follow the Dominican rule and, if the other Dominican Sisters in the missions were added, the total number would be 238.

The following table shows the ten orders or societies of men and women, respectively, with the largest numbers of American members in the foreign mission fields at this time:

<i>Order or Society</i>	<i>Members</i>	<i>Fields</i>	<i>Dominicans (other than</i>		
MEN			<i>Maryknoll Sisters)</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>2</i>
Jesuits	384	11	Missionary Sisters,		
Maryknoll Missioners	264	12	Servants of the Holy		
Franciscans (various) ..	196	18	Ghost	39	7
Redemptorists	136	3	Sisters of Mercy	34	3
Marianists	110	5			
Sacred Hearts Fathers					
(SS. CC.)	67	2			
Oblates of Mary					
Immaculate	63	5			
Vincentians	51	4			
Holy Cross Congregation	50	1			
Holy Ghost Congregation	48	2			
WOMEN					
Franciscans (various) ..	336	15			
Maryknoll Sisters	198	6			
Charity Sisters (various)	115	11			
Notre Dame Sisters					
(various)	83	5			
Marist Sisters	73	4			
Sisters Servants of the					
Immaculate Heart of					
Mary	52	3			
St. Joseph Sisters					
(various)	47	3			



THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF: John LaFarge EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

PUBLISHER: Gerald C. Treacy BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph Carroll

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.